

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

THE DECENNIAL PUBLICATIONS

STUDIES CONCERNING ADRIAN IV.

BY
OLIVER JOSEPH THATCHER



THE DECENTNIAL PUBLICATIONS

FIRST SERIES

Two volumes of REPORTS and eight volumes of INVESTIGATIONS, the latter consisting of a collection of articles representing the work of research of the several departments of the University. Size, quarto.

VOLUME I. The President's Report. A. Administration.

VOLUME II. The President's Report. B. Publications of the Members of the University.

VOLUME III. PART 1.—Systematic Theology, Church History, Practical Theology.

PART 2.—Philosophy, Education.

VOLUME IV. Political Economy, Political Science, History, Sociology.

VOLUME V. Semitic Languages and Literatures, Biblical and Patristic Greek, Comparative Religion.

VOLUME VI. Greek Language and Literature, Latin Language and Literature, Sanskrit and Indo-European Comparative Philology, Classical Archæology.

VOLUME VII. Romance Languages and Literatures, Germanic Languages and Literatures, English, Literature in English.

VOLUME VIII. Astronomy and Astrophysics.

VOLUME IX. Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Geology.

VOLUME X. Zoology, Anatomy, Physiology, Neurology, Botany, Pathology, Bacteriology.

SECOND SERIES

A series of volumes embodying original research, consisting of systematic treatises, unpublished documents, and the like. Size, octavo.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

THE DECENNIAL PUBLICATIONS

STUDIES CONCERNING ADRIAN IV.

BY

OLIVER JOSEPH THATCHER

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF MEDIEVAL AND ENGLISH HISTORY

PRINTED FROM VOLUME IV

CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
1903

Dec 15-1917
a
48271

Copyright 1902
BY THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

YANAGI SANO
SOKAIGAKO NO

PRINTED APRIL 1, 1903

TO THE MEMORY OF
MY TEACHER AND FRIEND
PROFESSOR PAUL SCHEFFER-BOICHLORST
(DIED JANUARY THE SEVENTEENTH, 1902)

STUDIES CONCERNING ADRIAN IV.

OLIVER JOSEPH THATCHER

I. THE OFFER OF IRELAND TO HENRY II.

A review of the question.—Among the many celebrated questions which have puzzled historians is to be numbered the one which is the subject of this article. Its discussion has been obscured and embittered by the hostilities engendered by differences in race, in nationality, and in religion. Although it has, almost from the beginning, had absolutely nothing to do with the practical question of the relation between England and Ireland, it has been discussed with all the intensity, not to say bitterness, of feeling that has grown out of the unhappy relations existing between those countries for the last seven hundred years. All things considered, it is not strange that the desire to know the exact historical truth has not always been the single motive of all those who have written on the question. Without in the least charging them with bad faith, it may be said that other considerations have sometimes had some influence on their attitude toward this matter. Irishmen, as Irishmen, in the spirit of high patriotism for which they have always been famed, have endeavored to defend the fair name of their island and people by declaring that the famous bull *Laudabiliter*, by which Pope Adrian IV. is said to have given Ireland to Henry II., is a forgery, abounding in slanderous falsehoods. As loyal Catholics, they have been unwilling to believe that a pope made himself a party to their misfortunes by delivering them into the hands of their enemy. They have, therefore, quite naturally sought in every way to discredit *Laudabiliter*. In this their belief that the bull is a forgery, they have found many supporters on the continent, in whom the same mixed motives may sometimes be discovered. Nor, on the other hand, can it be said that a single motive has influenced all those who have defended *Laudabiliter*. It is impossible not to see what we may call a certain Protestant satisfaction in attributing to a pope a share in the humiliation of Catholic Ireland in being subject to a foreign Protestant power. It is therefore not surprising that there is still the widest divergence of opinion on this question.

Father Stephen White, an Irishman and a Jesuit, whose approximate dates are 1573–1648, devoted many years of his life to a learned effort to prove that Adrian IV. did not give Ireland to Henry II., and that therefore *Laudabiliter* is a forgery and an aspersion on Ireland. Sommervogel, in his *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Vol. VIII, cols. 1093–8, gives a brief description of this learned man and of his works, most of which are still in manuscript. So far as I know, only one of his numerous writings has appeared in print. His *Apologia pro Hibernia* was edited and published by Rev. Matthew Kelly, in Dublin, 1849. At his death, his manuscripts, or at least

a part of them, fell into the hands of Father John Lynch,¹ who made free use of them in preparing his great work *Cambreensis Eversus*. This also was published with a translation and notes by Rev. Matthew Kelly, Dublin, 1848. As its title indicates, it is an attempt to destroy the credibility of Giraldus Cambrensis, or Gerald Barry, as he is often called. Giraldus was made the object of their common attack because in his work *De Expugnatione Hiberniae*, the first edition of which was written about 1188, he not only says that Adrian IV. gave Ireland to Henry II., and publishes for the first time the text of *Laudabiliter*, but he also justifies this gift by painting Ireland and the Irish in the blackest colors. To White and Lynch the best way to disprove the grant and *Laudabiliter* was to discredit Giraldus. Seen from the point of view of today this was unfortunate, because they thereby started the discussion along a way that could not lead to a sure conclusion, and they also introduced into the question a great many things that are entirely foreign to it. White and Lynch expended a vast amount of energy and learning in refuting Giraldus, a labor that has been made in part unnecessary by the critical judgments of his most recent editors.² But they failed to see, as many since their day have failed to see, that the question of the genuineness of *Laudabiliter* must be settled by other criteria.

The attack on *Laudabiliter* was continued in the eighteenth century by the Abbé MacGeoghegan, whose *History of Ireland* was translated and published by Patrick O'Kelly, Esq., in Dublin, 1844 (see pp. 238 ff.). Rev. John Lanigan, D.D., in his *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*, Vol. IV, pp. 159 ff. (4 vols., Dublin, 1822), undertook to refute the arguments of the above-named writers, and asserted most confidently and positively that the bull is genuine, and that therefore Adrian IV. had actually made the grant to Henry II.

Since that day the literature on the subject has rapidly increased.³ But in spite

¹ Lynch wrote under the pen name of Gratianus Lucius. In the Introduction to *Cambreensis Eversus* the editor says that on the surrender of Galway, 1652, Lynch fled to France. He probably lived for several years at Saint Malo, where he published *Cambreensis Eversus* in 1662. His death seems to have occurred about 1674.

For a special reason I wish to call attention to the two following passages: *Cambreensis Eversus*, Vol. II, p. 232: "Stephanus Vetus, cuius opera calamo tantum exarata, nec dum praeolo commissa, penes me habeo, etc." Also *ibid.*, p. 394: "Vetus . . . penes se habuit velutum coenobii Scotorum Ratisbonensis chronicon et ex eo quae e sua fore censebat excerpit, . . . Nunquam ego scriptum vidi anachronismis magis inquinatum, attamen e patris Viti apographo ea desumam quae, etc." From another passage we learn that this manuscript of the Irish monks at Regensburg contained the statement that Adrian IV., while a student at Paris, had had for his teacher an Irish monk named Marianus. As I am engaged in writing a life of Adrian IV., I wish, if possible, to find either the original manuscript or White's copy of it. I shall be greatly obliged to anyone who can give me any information about it.

² See *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera* edited by JAMES F. DIMOCK, Vol. V, pp. lxi ff. "The treatise [De Expugnatione Hiberniae] certainly is, in great measure, rather a poetical fiction than a prosaic truthful history" (p. lxxi).

³ Besides the numerous works in which the question is discussed incidentally, a great many articles and books have been devoted exclusively to an investigation of it. Chief among these are the following: CARDINAL MORAN, "Adriau IV. and Ireland," *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 1872, pp. 62 ff.; also in *Australasian Catholic Record*, April-July, 1897; *contra*, "Adrien IV. et l'Irlande," two anonymous articles in *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, 1882, fascicles 185, 186; *contra*, F. A. GASQUET, "Adrian IV. and Ireland," *Dublin Review*, 1883; *contra*, S. MALONE, "Adrian IV. and Ireland," *ibid.*, 1884; also his "Adrian IV. and Ireland," *Dublin*, Gill & Son, 1899, pp. 106; *pro*, W. B. MORRIS, "Adrian IV. and Henry Plantagenet," three articles in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 1885; also in his *Ireland and St. Patrick*, 1891; *contra*, B. JUNGMANN, *Dissertationes Selectae*, Vol. V, pp. 213 ff.; *contra*, O. PFÜLF, "Papst Hadriau IV. und die Schenkung Irlands," *Stimmen aus Maria-Luach*, 1889; *pro*, A. BELLESHEIM, *Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Irland*, Vol. I, pp. 367, ff.; *contra*, PFLUGK-HARTTUNG, "Zwei Papstbriefe Gregors VII. und Hadrians IV. wegen Irland," *Brieger's Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. XIII (1892), pp. 107 ff.; also, "Drei Breven päpstlicher Machtfülle im 11ten und 12ten Jahrhundert," *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, Vol. X (1893), pp. 323 ff.; *contra*, KATE NORRAGE, "The Bull Laudabiliter," *English Historical Review*, 1893, pp. 18 ff.; *pro*, L. GINNELL,

of the great learning and ability of those who have written on the subject, it seems that not much progress has been made toward the solution of the question. No agreement has been reached on the chief points at issue. Great ingenuity and cleverness have been expended in the discussion without reaching conclusions that are in the least convincing. Statement has been met by contradiction, and counter-statement by counter-contradiction. The same fact has been made to do service on both sides of the question, and what has been regarded by some as a certain proof of the genuineness of the bull has been looked upon by others as a conclusive evidence of its forgery. An amazing amount of material foreign to the question has been brought into the discussion. Many arguments have been advanced which have little or no bearing on the case, and in rebutting such arguments other material still less germane to the subject has been introduced. Every writer on the subject has felt that he must thresh over this material, and so the real and original question has often been lost sight of. Furthermore, there has been a radical error in one of their assumptions, which has consequently vitiated much of their reasoning. They have all, with the single exception of Mr. Round, assumed that the pope's grant of Ireland and the bull *Laudabiliter* must stand or fall together. Without any hesitation they have argued from the truth or falsity of the one to the truth or falsity of the other. Those who were persuaded that the bull is a forgery have, almost without further thought or argument and as a matter of course, concluded that the grant was never made. And on the other hand, those who believed in the existence of the grant have regarded as necessary the conclusion that *Laudabiliter* is genuine. I believe that this false assumption has been an effectual hindrance to the successful solution of the problem.

The method of attack, for investigation it cannot be called, pursued by Hergenröther, whose great learning was indisputable, seems worthy of special condemnation. He attacked the bull by many different lines of argument which were mutually destructive of each other, because one line of argument was based on a set of suppositions and interpretations that are contradictory to those on which another line of argument is based. But by each line he aimed to arrive at a greater or less degree of probability that the bull is a forgery. And then, as if such evidence were cumulative, he adds up all these probabilities and triumphantly concludes that the grant was never made and therefore the bull is a forgery. But surely two lines of argument based on contradictory assumptions cannot be held mutually to strengthen each other, nor is the probability arrived at by the one increased by the probability arrived at by the other.

The Doubtful Grant of Ireland by Pope Adrian IV. to Henry II. Investigated, 1899. The substance of this book had previously appeared in a series of articles in *New Ireland Review*; contra, RABY, *Pope Hadrian IV.*, 1849; pro, TARLETON, *Nicolas Breakspear, Englishman and Pope*, 1895; pro, L. C. CASARELLI, "Adrian IV." *Dublin Review*, January, 1902; pro, HERGENRÖTHER, *Kirche und Staat*, pp. 350 ff., and in his *Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. I, pp. 870 ff.; contra, DAMBERGER, "Hadrian IV. und Irland," *Der Katholik*, 1864; contra; the article is attributed to Dam-

berger, but it is signed S.; J. H. ROUND, "The Pope and the Conquest of Ireland," in his historical essays entitled *The Commune of London and Other Studies*, 1899; contra, Bagwell, *Ireland under the Tudors*, Vol. I, p. 37; pro.

I wish to acknowledge with pleasure and gratitude my indebtedness to Monsignor Giles, rector of the English College, and to Monsignor Murphy, rector of the Irish College, at Rome, for their kindness in granting me the free and frequent use of the college libraries, in one or the other of which I found nearly all the works here named.

This is a pernicious method, and all the more to be deplored because it is frequently employed.

It remained for Dr. F. Liebermann, in a brief note in the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, 1892, Heft I, p. E 58, to point the way to a new and more profitable discussion of the question by declaring that, although *Laudabiliter* might be a forgery, he regarded the fact of the grant as indisputable. My lamented teacher and friend, the late Professor Paul Scheffer-Boichorst, had already come to the same conclusion. He published the results of his investigation in *Mittheilungen des Instituts für öesterreichische Geschichtsforschung*, IV. Ergänzungsband, 1893, pp. 101–22. His article bore the title, “Hat Papst Hadrian IV. zu Gunsten des englischen Königs über Irland verfügt?” His article was briefly noticed in the *English Historical Review*, Vol. IX (1894), p. 412, but it apparently escaped the notice of all the Englishmen and Irishmen who have since then written on the subject. Even Mr. Round seems to have known nothing of it, although an examination of it might have prevented him from falling into certain errors. Although later writers on the subject have made no reference to his work, his arguments seem to me irrefragable, his conclusions final. I have freely used his materials and arguments, as well as those of all who have written on the subject before me. I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to them all, but especially to Professor Scheffer-Boichorst. By separating the question of the grant from that of *Laudabiliter*, many of the objections and arguments of previous writers fall to the ground of themselves. It has not seemed to me advisable to repeat their arguments in order to show just how they are refuted by the line of proof followed by Scheffer-Boichorst and which I have here amplified. The mere development of the arguments will, I hope, make it unnecessary to refute in detail all that previous writers have said in opposition to the conclusions here arrived at. To have indicated exactly where and by whom each argument, fact, or observation has been used, besides making this study unnecessarily long, would be not only unprofitable but also practically impossible. I have sometimes grouped the materials and arguments differently and, I hope, more effectively. I have also, I believe, in certain points carried the discussion farther and made some new combinations, especially in the discussion of the reasons why Henry II. rejected Adrian's offer. The discussion of the supposed letter of Henry II. to Adrian IV. is wholly my own.

The question investigated.—Since, as Dr. Liebermann pointed out, there are two distinct questions involved, it will be necessary to separate them and discuss each one of them on its own merits. It will be best, first of all, to discover, if we can, the exact character and extent of the negotiations which took place between Henry II. and Adrian IV. concerning Ireland. Such a method of procedure is the logical one and should clear the ground for the investigation of *Laudabiliter*. It is to be regretted that Mr. Round did not see fit to discuss this part of the problem also, instead of devoting himself exclusively to an examination of *Laudabiliter*.

We may begin with the testimony of Robertus de Torigneio, that chronicler who was most nearly contemporaneous with the event under discussion. We find that

this Robertus de Torigneio has the following entry in his chronicle under the year 1155:

Circa festum sancti Michaelis [September 29] Henricus rex Anglorum, habito concilio apud Winecestre, de conquirendo regno Hiberniae et Guillermo fratri suo dando cum optimatibus suis tractavit. Quod quia matri eius Imperatrici non placuit, intermissa est ad tempus illa expeditio.⁴

Since this Robert died in 1186, his testimony is practically contemporaneous. Many mediæval chroniclers seem to have aimed at brevity more than any other quality. A year's campaign, even a whole war, a movement that extended through years, is often spoken of as if it were a simple event and dismissed in a single sentence. It need therefore not be inferred from this statement of Robert that the plan of conquering Ireland was not discussed at any other time, or that it was in this council at Winchester that the Empress Matilda dissuaded the king from the undertaking. In fact, the words seem to imply that the plan was, at least practically, agreed upon at Winchester, but that afterward, owing to the opposition of the empress, the expedition was postponed. At any rate, we know from other sources, soon to be quoted, that the king's mind was occupied with this matter for several months. However, there is no further mention of his brother William in connection with this scheme. But, while we have no corroborative evidence of this part of the plan here attributed to the king, there is no good reason for questioning the truth of the statement made by Robert.

We know that, instead of giving up the invasion of Ireland in the council at Winchester, the king proceeded immediately to send an embassy to the pope, Adrian IV., to ask the consent of his holiness to the proposed undertaking. In proof of this, Roger de Wendover (died 1236), who used as the basis for his chronicle the work of John of the Cell (abbot of St. Albans, 1195–1214), has the following passage: "Per idem tempus rex Anglorum Henricus nuntios solemnes Romam mittens rogavit papam Adrianum ut sibi liceret Hiberniae insulam hostiliter intrare et terram subjungare," etc. (*Rerum Britanicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores*, Roger de Wendover, Vol. I, p. 11.)

Matthew of Paris, monk of St. Albans, copied the work of Roger de Wendover, but made many additions to it from the archives of his monastery, to which he had access. In his *Chronica Maiora*, Vol. II, pp. 210 f., he has merely copied Roger's account, but elsewhere he has given us new and important information about this embassy. In his *Historia Minor*, Vol. I, p. 304, he says that Henry sent to the pope to ask "ut sibi liceret sine scandalo laesioni fidei Christianae Hiberniae insulam intrare," etc. Further, in his *Vita XXIII. Abbatum S. Albani* (Wats's edition, 1684, pp. 969 ff.), the same author gives a long account of this embassy to the pope, from which I quote the following passage:

Audita igitur apud nos promotione domini papae Adriani, exultans, Robertus abbas, ad reparandas huius ecclesiae antiquas dignitates, ad iter transalpinum accingitur; equos praeparat, impensas perquirit, exenia congregat, quae ad pretium septies viginti marcuarum (praeter cyphos quinque et mitras tres pretiosissimas et sandalia, et alia desiderabilia) sunt aestimata. Die igitur

⁴ See MIGNE, *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. CLXIX, col. 480; HEFELE, *geschichte*, Vol. V², pp. 682 f., and SCHEFFER-BOICHORST also M. G. H., Vol. VI, p. 505. Both HEFELE, *Concilien-* have emphasized the importance of this passage.

S. Dionysii [October 9] iter arripuit Romanum petiturus, illius comitatui adhaerentibus tribus episcopis Caenomanensi, Luxoviensi, et Ebroicensi. Dederat namque in mandatis rex Henricus secundus, noviter intinctus, ipsis episcopis et eidem abbati Roberto quatenus *quaedam ardua negotia regalia*, de quibus non pertinet ut enarramus ad praesens, Romae expedirent. Constituit etiam rex ipsum abbatem sui negotii suum procuratorem praecipuum et sumnum et confecit eis inde litteras regio sigillo signatas. In quibus humiliter et devote dominum papam deprecatus est ut se favorabilem tam negotiis ecclesiae S. Albani quam suis propriis exhiberet, utpote patrocinatui ipsius specialiter subiacentis. Recedentes igitur ab Anglia naves condescendunt. Intumescente autem mari imminet periculum ian demersionis. Abbas autem specialiter invocans auxilium b. Margaritae, virginis et martyris, repentinum et contra omnium opinionem sensit in naufragio suffragium. Unde vovit quod in eccllesia nomen eius in litania poneretur propensius honorandum. Prospere igitur applicantes et postea itinerantes et multas latronum insidias evadentes, tandem Beneventum ubi dominum papam inveniunt, pervenerunt. Qui eos sereno vultu et animo gaudenti suscepit, et insolitum honorem exhibuit. Expediunt regalia pro libitu negotia. Remanente igitur abbatem, recedunt episcopi regi favorem papalem et diligentiam abbatis renunciantes. Dominus enim papa amicabiliter cogit abbatem remanere, ut propensius cum ipso colloquium continuaret, et eiusdem moram versus regem per episcopos excusavit.

The council at Winchester was held about September 29, 1155, and this embassy set out to go to the pope on October 9 of the same year. The nearness in time and the statements of the chroniclers just considered lead one to the inference that one of the “*ardua negotia regalia*” had to do with the proposed invasion of Ireland. But there was a good reason why Matthew of Paris did not wish to mention this fact: the embassy had failed to get the pope’s consent to the invasion. This was probably apparent from the records of the monastery from which Matthew drew the materials for his narrative just quoted. At any rate, he knew from the statement of John of Salisbury that the embassy had not been successful. For nearly one hundred years the world had known that it was John of Salisbury who had secured whatever concession of Ireland Adrian IV. had made to Henry II., because John himself had published this fact in one of his writings, as we may say, over his own signature. So, if Matthew of Paris had named the exact purpose of the embassy, the failure of his abbot would thereby have become apparent to all. That would have been to publish the humiliation of his abbot who failed in a matter in which John of Salisbury so easily succeeded. I wish to remark that Matthew of Paris shared the erroneous opinion of his time as to the importance of the so-called grant of Adrian IV., and would have been glad to add to the honor of his monastery by making it appear that it was its abbot who had been the successful ambassador of King Henry in this matter. But the well-known statement of John of Salisbury made this impossible. Matthew, therefore, as we have seen, deals only in generalities when speaking of the business on which the embassy was sent.

The ambassadors set out on their journey on October 9, 1155. While crossing the channel a storm overtook them. They barely escaped shipwreck. Scheffer-Boichorst says they were shipwrecked, but I question that interpretation of Matthew’s words, all the more because the horses and the presents for the pope were apparently got ashore without loss or damage, as is to be inferred from Matthew’s further account.

Besides, in the Middle Age, people lived in an atmosphere of miracle, and it is a characteristic of mediæval writers that they exaggerate nearly every event, which seemed to them extraordinary, into a miracle. The pious desire to do honor to some saint was not the least of the motives which led them to make exaggerated statements about such occurrences. The impelling motives here seem to me to be apparent; Matthew wished to do honor to St. Margaret as well as to heighten the dignity of the abbot of St. Alban's, by showing how he had been the object of St. Margaret's solicitous care. The journey by land was not less free from exciting experiences, but the ambassadors safely reached Benevento, where Adrian IV. was then residing. From his bulls and letters we know that Adrian held his court at Benevento from November 21, 1155, to July 10, 1156.

We have an independent and unimpeachable witness to the fact that the king sent this embassy. It is no less a person than Adrian IV. himself. On April 25, 1156, he wrote to the chapter of the cathedral at Angers announcing his decision in a case that had been appealed to him by the king of England. This letter has been edited by Loewenfeld. That part of it which concerns us is as follows:

Adrianus Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, dilectis filiis universo capitulo Andegavensi salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Causa super controversia de electione pontificis per appellationem karissimi in Christo filii nostri regis Anglorum ad presentiam nostram delata, et quibusdam de fratribus vestris pro codem negotio ex vestra parte directis, venerabilibus quoque fratribus nostris R(otrodo) Ebroicensi et G(ilelmo) Cenomanensi episcopis et dilectis filiis nostris R(oberto) abbate S. Albini et G. decano S. Laudi ab eodem rege transmissis, in nostra presentia constitutis, utriusque partis allegationes audivimus, etc. Datum Beneventi VII. Kal. Maii.

From this letter it does not necessarily follow that these men, or indeed that any one of them, were in Benevento on the date of the letter, April 25, 1156. We know from official documents that Arnulf of Lisieux was at Rouen⁵ in February, 1156. From *Gallia Christiana*, Vol. XI, p. 577, we learn that Rotrodus⁶ celebrated Easter, 1156 (April 15), at Vezelay. Since Vezelay lay on the route from Rome to Evreux, it is probable that Rotrodus, returning from the embassy, reached Vezelay at Easter time. I have not been able to verify this statement of the authors of *Gallia Christiana* or to trace the movements of William of LeMans. But Matthew of Paris was undoubtedly well informed about the movements of the bishops.

We may now reconstruct the course of events as follows: The ambassadors of the king brought the appeal before the pope after the departure of Arnulf of Lisieux. After hearing both sides, the pope reserved his decision for a few days. In the meantime, the other bishops, or at least Rotrodus of Evreux, left Benevento. Even after the pope announced his decision it is not probable that the letter to the chapter at Angers was sent off at once. The papal secretaries were not always prompt, and several days may have elapsed before the letter was drawn up and duly signed. The date was the last thing to be added, and was naturally not the date of the trial, but of

⁵ See EYTON, *Court, Household, and Itinerary of King Henry*, 16, Nr. 1, 2.

⁶ "Roma rediens pascha apud Vizeliacum celebravit anno 1156."

the dispatching of the letter. Even Abbot Robert may not have been in Benevento on that day. If he was still there, he certainly set out for home very soon afterward, for he reached St. Albans May 31, the octave of Ascension Day.

Matthew of Paris had, as we have seen, a good reason for not being explicit in his statements about the success of the embassy in the affairs of the king. "*Expediunt regalia pro libitu negotia.*" The bishops' return, "*regi favorem papalem et diligentiam abbatis renunciantes,*" announcing the pope's favor, not his consent; the diligence of the abbot, not his success. So weak a statement, coming from a panegyrist, as Matthew of Paris confessedly was, would indicate little less than failure in the most important business of the embassy. In all other matters entrusted to the embassy, and they were, no doubt, many, the abbot may have been very successful. But the embassy certainly failed to secure the desired consent of the pope. We do not know what all the terms of the king's proposition were. The letter which contained his request has been lost and none of the ambassadors has recorded its contents for us. But if we consider the expressions just quoted from Roger de Wendover, "*hostiliter intrare et terram subiugare,*" and from Matthew of Paris, "*ut sibi licaret sine scandalo laesisionis fidei Christianae Hiberniac insulam intrare,*" we must, I think, conclude that Henry wished to conquer Ireland and to take absolute possession of it. By the right of conquest he desired to make it his own, we might almost say, his private and personal property. But there were weighty reasons why Adrian IV. could not grant this request.

Mediaeval rulers regarded it as a part of their duties to make war on any of the neighboring peoples who were still heathen, not only for the purpose of conquering them, but also and especially to Christianize them. But when such a people had once accepted Christianity and received an ecclesiastical organization, it came under the particular protection of the pope and therefore could not be subjugated and absorbed by another Christian power. A heathen nation was the common prey of all its Christian neighbors, but the acceptance of Christianity gave it the right to a separate independent national existence. And Ireland was already Christian, and therefore could not arbitrarily be invaded and subjugated by another Christian nation, *sine scandalo laesisionis fidei Christianae*. Only three years before this Cardinal Paparo had been sent as papal legate to Ireland. He held a synod at Mellifont,⁷ 1152, in which he erected four archbishoprics in Ireland and gave the pallia to the four ecclesiastics who were elevated to these archiepiscopal sees. So, just as William the Conqueror had sought and obtained the permission and blessing of Alexander II. for his projected invasion of England, Henry II. applied to Adrian IV. for permission to subjugate Ireland. And not only was Ireland Christian; Adrian regarded it as the property of St. Peter, and therefore he could not permit Henry to invade it and take possession of it. So it is not strange that this embassy failed to win the pope's consent to the proposed plan.

The pope would not consent to diminish the possessions of St. Peter by ceding

⁷ See MANSI, Vol. XXI, cols. 760-70, and HEFELE, Vol. V, 2d ed., pp. 531 f.

the absolute possession of Ireland to Henry. And yet, in accordance with feudal customs, he might, under circumstances, be willing to grant Henry the use of Ireland, that is, to give him the feudal possession of it. But there was a vast difference between *feudal* possession and *absolute* possession. Henry had asked for the absolute, not for the feudal possession, of the island. But the pope, at the suggestion of his most intimate friend, John of Salisbury, determined to offer him Ireland as a feudal possession. This offer may be regarded as in the nature of a compromise.

John of Salisbury, in his *Polycreticus*, Bk. VI, p. 24 (Migne, Vol. CXCI, col. 623), gives a long account of a visit which he made the pope at Benevento. Giraldus Cambrensis, apparently drawing a false inference from John's words, says that he went as the king's ambassador in this matter; "*per Johannem Salesberensem . . . Romam ad hoc destinatum.*" Others have unthinkingly copied this statement, but Abbé MacGeoghegan and Scheffer-Boichorst have called attention to the fact that John does not say that he was the king's ambassador. He went for the purpose of visiting⁸ his friend, the pope. He spent three months in Benevento in the most familiar intercourse with Adrian. He certainly met Abbot Robert there, as is apparent from a consideration of the dates given above. The abbot, having failed to win the pope's consent, confided his failure to John, who, with a good and justifiable motive, as we shall see, proposed a way out of the difficulty.

The passage in which John tells how he secured the grant has been much written about. But first a word must be said about the text of it. Giles, in his edition of the works of John of Salisbury, did not always use the best manuscripts and was not sufficiently exact in deciphering and establishing the text. Migne (Vol. CXCI) and Pauli (*M. G. SS.*, Vol. XXVII) have merely reprinted the text of Giles. From the character of the *Monumenta* we had the right to expect something more than a mere reprint. But we look in vain for any evidence that Pauli tried to improve the work of Giles.⁹ Dr. F. Liebermann, at the request of Scheffer-Boichorst, collated the passage in three manuscripts, one of the twelfth and two of the thirteenth century.¹⁰ The text, as established by this collation and edited by Scheffer-Boichorst, is as follows:

Sed hec hactenus. Jam enim flere magis vacat, quam scribere, et visibili arguento doceor, quod mundus totus *subiacet vanilati*.¹¹ *Expectarimus enim pacem et ecce turbatio*¹² *et tempestas ingruens*¹³ Tolosanis Anglos et Gallos undique concitat, et reges, quos amicissimos vidimus, se insaciabiliter persequuntur. Ad hec mors domini Adriani, summi pontificis, cum omnes Christiane religiones *populos nationesque*¹⁴ turbaverit, Angliam nostram, unde fuerat

⁸ *Visitandi causa.* Scheffer-Boichorst says that they had been friends in youth: "um seinem Jugendfreunde und Landsmaune, dem Papste, einen Besuch abzustatten." Although I think this extremely probable, I do not recall any authority for the statement.

⁹ Scheffer-Boichorst, indeed, makes the statement that Pauli did not collate a single manuscript for what we must therefore call his reprint.

¹⁰ Brit. Mus. Reg. 13 D. IV, fol. 208; cf. CASLEY, *Catal.*

of the MSS. in the King's Library, p. 226; Brit. Mus. Reg. 12 D. I.; cf. CASLEY, p. 205; Corpus Christi Cambridge Cod. 46; cf. NASMITH, *Catal. Lib. MSS. Coll. Corp. Christi Cantab.*, p. 30; cf. SCHEFFER-BOICHLST, *loc. cit.*, pp. 103 f.

¹¹ Eccles. 3:19.

¹² Jere. 11:19.

¹³ Prov. 1:27.

¹⁴ Cf. *Sup.*, V, 9.

oriundus, acerbiori dolore commovit irrigavitque lacrimis profusionibus. *Omnibus ille bonus flebilis occidit, sed nulli flebitior, quam mihi.*¹⁵ Cum enim matrem haberet et fratrem uterimum, me, quam illos, artiori diligebat affectu; fatebatur etiam publice et secreto, quia me pre omnibus mortalibus diligebat. Eam de me conceperat opinionem, ut quotiens oportunitas aderat, conscientiam suam in conspectu meo effundere letaretur. Et cum Romanus pontifex esset, me in propria mensa gaudebat habere convivam et eundem cipham et discum sibi et mihi volebat et faciebat, me renidente, esse communem. Ad preces meas illustri regi Anglorum Henrico secundo concessit et dedit Hiberniam iure hereditario possidendam, sicut littere ipsius testantur in hodiernum diem. Nam omnes insule de iure antiquo ex donacione Constantini, qui eam fundavit et dotavit, dicuntur ad Romanam ecclesiam pertinere. Anulum quoque per me transmisit aureum, smaragdo optimo decoratum, quo fieret investitura iuris in regenda Hibernia. Idemque adhuc anulus in ciniliarchio publico iussus est custodiri. Si virtutes eius percurrire velim, in magni voluminis librum hec una ex crescet materia. Omnium vero mentes magis exulcerat scissura ecclesie, que exigentibus culpis nostris contigit, tanto patre sublato. *Expectavit eam Sathanas, ut cribraret sicut triticum*¹⁶ et undique alterius Jude proditoris ministerio amaritudines et scandala spargit. Oriuntur bella plus quam civilia,¹⁷ etc.

Practically all who have written against the genuineness of *Laudabiliter* have declared this passage a forgery, however, on insufficient grounds. The following facts and considerations seem to me to refute all the objections that have been raised against it, and to make its authorship a certainty. In the first place, this passage is found in all the manuscripts of *Metalogicus*. We search in vain for any evidence in the written tradition that it was not a part of the original manuscript. And since *Metalogicus* was completed in 1159 (or at the very latest in 1160), and since there is one manuscript of it now in existence which was certainly written some time before 1200 (possibly as early as 1175), the argument from the written tradition, that is, from the manuscripts of *Metalogicus*, must therefore have very great weight, and that clearly points to John of Salisbury as the author of the whole work.

Furthermore, John's style is characterized by very numerous citations from the Bible and from classical authors. He was one of the few men of the twelfth century who were thoroughly familiar with the classical writers. He really deserves to be regarded as one of the earliest and most important forerunners of the Renaissance, and for literary attainments he can be boldly placed by the side of many of the Humanists.¹⁸ In the brief passage here cited there are not less than four or five quotations from the Bible and two from classical authors. This is unique and so thoroughly in keeping with his style that it alone almost suffices to prove that he is the author of it.

Then, too, the reference to the war between Louis VII. and Henry II., who were then facing each other before Toulouse, fits into the facts perfectly. For the English king was engaged in hostilities there from June 25, 1159, to November 1 of the same year. And Adrian IV. died September 1. The news of his death reached John just as he was completing his *Metalogicus*, certainly toward the end of September or early in October. And John penned this passage before he learned of the establishment of

¹⁵ HORACE, *Odes*, I, 24, line 9.

¹⁶ Luke 22:31.

¹⁷ LUCAN, *Pharsalia*, I, 1.

¹⁸ See SCHÄRSCHMIDT, *Johannes Saresberiensis nach Leben und Studien, Schriften und Philosophie*, also VOIGT, *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums*, Vol. I, 2d ed., p. 6.

peace between the two kings, which took place November 1. Such casual agreement with historical facts seems to me decisive. To have produced such harmony in the details would imply a degree of skill and cleverness that is otherwise lacking in mediaeval forgers.

Equally impossible is the supposition that it would have occurred to a forger to invent such unique details about the intimacy between Adrian IV. and John. And such intimacy is not at all incredible. Remember that Adrian was an Englishman in a foreign land, among a people of a different race and nationality, among a people whom he did not admire, among a people who, by their insistent selfishness, their turbulent demands, their violence and rebellion, greatly increased the already awful burden of his sublime office. At the time of John's visit he had been pope but little more than a year. But what a terrible year it had been for him! Driven from Rome by a rebellion accompanied by war and bloodshed; the lands of the chnrch invaded and devastated by William of Sicily, against whom he could find no aid; at that very moment in danger of being taken a prisoner of war by the troops of the Sicilian, who were advancing in victorious progress toward Benevento; disappointed in the hopes which he had placed on Frederick I., who was powerless to protect him; the college of cardinals divided on the most important questions of policy into two parties. As he himself said, the Lord had kept him continually between the hammer and anvil. Is it strange that under these circumstances his heart cried out for sympathy? One has but to read the undisputed accounts which John¹⁹ has given us of his private conversations with Adrian to see what a solitude oppressed the pope's soul. The solitariness of his supreme position and unique office was increased and made more dreary by the isolation which he, as an Englishman, felt among Italians. Was it not enough to make his soul cleave to that of his friend who was of his own race and therefore better able to understand him? These few words of John give us a view of the inmost soul of Adrian which to me is beyond price.²⁰

As a convincing proof of the forgery of this passage much has been made of the expression *in hodiernum diem* (for this is the correct text and not *usque in* nor *usque ad hodiernum diem*), which, it is said, could not be used by a writer of an event so recent. For the gift was made in 1155 and John finished his *Metalogicus* toward the end of 1159. But *in hodiernum diem* is not as emphatic as *usque in* would be. It should be translated simply "As his letter still testifies," and not "even unto the present day." John says no more than that Adrian's letter is still in existence, a fact that was all the more remarkable in his eyes because, as we shall see, the terms of the letter had never been fulfilled, and the letter itself was therefore without value and not worth being preserved.

The fact that John appeals to the forged *Donation of Constantine* has been regarded as a sufficient ground for rejecting this passage. But we have abundant

¹⁹ *Polycreticus*, Bk. VI, p. 24, and Bk. VIII, p. 23; MIGNE, Vol. CXCIII, cols. 623-6, and cols. 813, 814. See also John's letter to Walter, cardinal Bishop of Albano, *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, Vol. VI, p. 363.

²⁰ I reserve a fuller description of these difficulties which beset Adrian IV. and a more detailed discussion of these passages of John of Salisbury for my work on the life of Adrian.

evidence that this famous document was generally known and, relatively speaking, not infrequently used by popes as well as by chroniclers.²¹ Of course, the *Donation of Constantine* does not say that Constantine gave all islands to the pope, but only certain possessions in various countries and islands for the support of the lights in the churches. I regret that, not having the better text of Zeumer at hand, I cannot quote from it. Here is the passage:

Quibus pro conceignatione luninariorum possessionum praedia contulimus et rebus diversis eas ditavimus, et per nostram imperialem iussionem sacrau tam in Oriente quam in Occidente vel etiam septentrionali et meridiana plaga, videlicet in Iudea, Grecia, Asia, Tracia, Africa, et Italia, vel diversis insulis nostra largitate eis concessimus, ea prorsus ratione ut per manus beatissimi Silvestri pontificis successorumque omnia disponantur. (Hinschius, *Decratales Pseudo-Isidorianae*, p. 253, and *Mansi*, Vol. II, pp. 603 ff.)

But the exact meaning of the *Donation* was soon forgotten, and it came to be believed that, according to the terms of the *Donation*, Constantine had given all islands to Pope Sylvester. And it was this larger interpretation of the *Donation* which prevailed.

That various popes knew, believed in, and made use of this interpretation of the *Donation* there can be no doubt, as will be clearly evident from an examination of the following quotations from papal writings and official documents.

Waiving the question whether Adrian I (772-95) quoted the *Donation*, we come to Leo IX., who twice made use of it. In his letter (*anno* 1053) to Michael Caenularius there is the following passage:

Tantum apicem coelestis dignitatis in b. Petro et in suis vicariis prudentissimus terrenae monarchiae princeps Constantinus intima consideratione reveritus, eunctos usque in finem saeculi successuros eidem apostolo in Romana sede pontifices, per b. Silvestrum non solum imperiali potestate et dignitate, verum etiam infulis et ministris adornavit imperialibus, valde indignum fore arbitratus terreno imperio subdi quos divina maiestas praefecit coelesti, etc. (Migne, Vol. CXLIII, col. 752.)

In his letter to the emperor, Constantine Monomachus, Leo IX. twice refers to the *Donation* in terms no less explicit (Migne, Vol. CXLIII, cols. 778-80).

Gregory VII. did not quote the *Donation*, although it would seem, at first sight, to support his claims of universal sovereignty. But it evidently did not serve his purpose to quote it because he attributed all the authority of the church to the direct gift of God, and not to the favor of the emperor. The *Dictatus Papac*, which was once attributed to him, is now known to have been drawn from the collection of canons

²¹ The best discussions of the *Donation of Constantine* are the following: HAUCK, *Luthardt's Zeitschrift für Kirchliche Wissenschaft u. kirchliches Leben*, 1888, p. 201 ff.; FRIEDRICH, *Die Constantinische Schenkung*, 1889; MARTENS, *Die falsche General-Concession Constantini des Grossen*, 1889; LAMPRECHT, *Römische Frage v. K. Pippin b. a. Kaiser Ludwig d. Frommen*, 1889; WIELAND, *Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, Vol. XXII, pp. 185 ff.; ZEUMER UND BRUNNER, *Festgabe für Gutsch*, 1888; HERGENRÖTHER, *Kirche u. Staat*, pp. 360 ff.; DÖLLINGER, *Papstfabeln des Mittelalters*, pp. 61 ff.; SCHEFFER-BOICHLST, M. I. O. G., Vol. X pp. 302 ff., and Vol. XI, pp. 128 ff.

In writings other than papal traces of the use of the legend are found in the *Vita Hadriani I*, written early in the ninth century, and in the synod of Aachen, 836. It is quoted by the following authors: Aeneas, bishop of Paris, died 870 (MIGNE, Vol. CXXI, col. 758); Ado, archbishop of Vienna, died 875 (*ibid.*, Vol. CXXXIII, col. 91); Liutprand of Cremona, died 970 (M. G. SS., Vol. III, pp. 350 f., 358, 362); Benedict of St. Andrea (*ibid.*, p. 699); Ermoldus Nigellus (*ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 506); Petrus Damiani (Libelli de Lite, Vol. I, p. 80); Anctor Gallicus (*ibid.*, p. 12). This list could easily be extended if necessary.

made by Cardinal Deusdedit. The eighth paragraph of the *Dictatus*, "quod papa solus possit uti imperialibus insigniis," is certainly based on the *Donation*.

With the pontificate of Urban II. (1088-99) the *Donation*, as Döllinger correctly observes, entered on a new phase of its history. An enlarged interpretation and a new legal basis were given it, as will be apparent from a consideration of the two following documents:

Urbanus Episcopus s. s. Dei dilecto fratri Ambrosio abbatii Liparitano, eiusque successoribus regulariter substituendis in perpetuum. *Cum universae insulae secundum instituta regalia iuris publici sint, constat profecto quia religiosi Imperatoris Constantini pririlegio in ius proprium b. Petro eiusque successoribus occidentales omnes insulae condonatae sunt, maxime quae circa Italiae oram habentur, quarum multae, peccatis exigentibus accolaram, a Saracenis captae, Christiani nominis gloriam amiserunt, etc.* (Pirri, *Sicilia Sacra*, 3d ed., p. 952.)

It bears the date of June 3, 1091. The second document of Urban II. begins as follows:

Urbanus E. s. s. D. d. f. Daiberto Pisanorum episcopo eiusque successoribus canonice substituendis in perpetuum. *Cum omnes insulae secundum statuta legalia iuris publici habeantur, constat etiam eas religiosi Imperatoris Constantini liberalitate ac privilegio in b. Petri vicariorumque eius ius proprium esse collocatas, etc.* Datum Beneventi IV. Kal. Julii, MXCI. (See Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, Vol. III, col. 369.)

This is not the place to follow out the history of the *Donation* in later times, but it may be interesting to add the famous lines of Dante, which will show us how great importance the poet attached to it:

Ahi, Constantin, di quanto mal fu matre,
Non la tua conversion, ma quella dote
Che da te prese il primo ricco patre.

—*Inferno*, XIX, 115 ff.

These bulls of Urban II., the originals of which are preserved, are shown to be genuine by every test that can be applied to them; hence all the objections that have been made against them fall to the ground. We have only to concern ourselves here with the meaning of them. The following statement, I believe, adequately expresses the sense of the two documents:

According to the law of the Roman empire all islands belonged to the public fiscus, or, as we might now say, they were government property. And since it was assumed that the emperor might dispose of such property as he saw fit, it is, therefore, evident that, by the grant of Constantine, all such islands are now the freehold possession, *ius proprium*, of St. Peter, and are consequently under the absolute control of the reigning pope. By virtue of his sovereignty over the islands Urban II. actually gave Corsica to the bishop of Pisa and the Lipari islands to Abbot Ambrosius.

There are here in these documents two things that are new: first, the statement that all western islands belong to St. Peter, and, secondly, the legal basis on which this possession rests, namely, because by Roman law they had been a part of the public domain. With the genesis of these new ideas we have nothing to do at present.

In the light of the above passages, it would be idle to deny that popes made use of the *Donation of Constantine* during the Middle Age, and no objection can be made to the genuineness of the passage in the *Metalogicus* or to the recorded action of Adrian IV. because John of Salisbury cites the *Donation*. John's statement agrees explicitly with the conception expressed in the bulls of Urban II., and it may be asserted with certitude that Adrian IV. believed that Ireland was under his control because, being an island, it was a freehold or allodial possession of St. Peter.

To sum up, we may therefore confidently accept the passage in *Metalogicus* as genuine, because, first, it is not in the least discredited by any of its contents, such as the statements about the remarkable intimacy between Adrian IV. and John of Salisbury, the expression *in hodiernum diem*, or the reference to the *Donation of Constantine*; because, secondly, all the evidence to be obtained from the manuscripts in which it is preserved goes to show that it was contained in the original manuscript; because, thirdly, it is thoroughly in the style of John, being in a unique way characterized by quotations from classical Latin writers; and because, lastly, it is corroborated by agreeing in the most casual and convincing manner with the historical situation and facts otherwise known and vouched for.

We may now pass to the interpretation of the passage in *Metalogicus* in order to determine the character of the grant offered by Adrian to Henry II.: "Regi Henrico . . . concessit et dedit Hiberniam iure hereditario possidendam . . . anulum transmisit . . . quo fieret investitura iuris in regenda Hibernia."

In the first place, it is evident that we have before us a feudal grant. Henry II. is to be invested only with the *ius in regenda Hibernia*, that is, with the government of Ireland. He is to become the feudal lord of Ireland and Ireland is to become his fief. As a possession, therefore, it still belongs to St. Peter. Secondly, whatever is, by this investiture, given to Henry, is given not simply to him personally and for his lifetime, but also to his heir, *iure hereditario*.

But it has been objected that *concessit et dedit* could not be used for the granting of a fief, because they denote rather a gift; there is therefore, it is said, a serious contradiction in the statement of John of Salisbury. But one needs only to turn to the official documents of that period by which fiefs were granted on similar terms, to find that *concessit et dedit* are used constantly in the granting of fiefs. Let the following examples suffice as proof of the statement. *Damus et concedimus in feudum* occurs in a document quoted by Ficker, *Studien zur Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte Italiens*, Vol. I, p. 237, § 124. Also in § 137 there are several passages containing the same words. In a document of Conrad III., anno 1142, to be found in Böhmer, *Acta Imperii Inedita*, p. 79, we find *in beneficium dedimus*. In the same work, p. 158, we find, "Civitatem Sutrium cum toto episcopatu et comitatatu suo *damus concedimus et nomine recti feodi in perpetuum tenenda confirmavimus*." That this technical formula was not unknown to the papal secretaries is proved by the fact that Anaclete II. used it in the document by which he granted the lands of southern Italy as a fief to King Roger, 1130, September 27. "Concedimus igitur et donamus et auctorizamus tibi et

filio tuo . . . coronam regni," etc. The terms of the grant are given a little later. "Has nostras concessiones sic concedimus tradimus et auctorizamus tibi et tuis filiis habenda et possidenda iure perpetuo dum nobis nostrisque successoribus homagium et fidelitatem . . . facies vel facient, iuraveris vel iuraverint," etc. Watterich, *Pontificum Romanorum Vitae*, Vol. II, p. 194.²²

I may remark in passing that it had long been the fixed policy of all the popes to enlarge the possessions of St. Peter, not to diminish them. Adrian IV., his biographer tells us, vigorously pursued the same policy. To diminish the patrimony of St. Peter by giving away so large a possession as Ireland was would have been without parallel in the history of the period, and could have been justified only by the receipt of the largest and most solid advantages for the Church in return. And even granting that Adrian might have wished to make the gift (for which there is no evidence; indeed he refused Henry's request) it is not at all probable that he could have got the consent of the college of cardinals to do so.

We may, therefore, confidently conclude that, according to the words of John of Salisbry, Henry was, by means of the ring, to be invested with the feudal possession of Ireland. He was to become the pope's man and to do homage to him for Ireland. The ceremony of investiture would naturally be performed by the pope's legate, who, at that time, was Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury.

Scheffer-Boichorst cites as a similar instance the case of the king of the Isle of Man, who, in 1219, surrendered his little kingdom to the pope, Honorius III., and received it back from him as a fief. By means of a gold ring, sent him by the pope for this purpose, he was invested with his kingdom by the papal legate, the bishop of Norwich. See *Raynaldi Annales Eccles.*, for the year 1219, § 44, Vol. XIII, p. 297.

But although Adrian thus offered to invest Henry with the government of Ireland, there is no evidence that the investiture ever took place. During the next years Henry did not add to his titles that of "Lord of Ireland." This fact alone would be sufficient evidence that he was never invested with it.

Neither does John of Salisbury say that Henry was invested with Ireland. He brought the ring *quo fieret iurcstitura*, but there is not the slightest indication in John's words that the purpose was carried into effect. Furthermore, we cannot find any evidence that Adrian's offer had any influence on the course of events during the next few years. Henry did not advance any claim to Ireland in consequence of it. When he went to Ireland to take possession of it (1172) he did not appeal to the fact that he had been invested with it by Adrian. He did not even publish the fact that the pope had offered to invest him with it. Why? Because, the act of investiture not having been performed, the offer had no binding force, and no permanent value.

We must conclude, therefore, that Henry did not do homage to the pope nor swear fealty to him for Ireland. Since the offer was not accepted and acted upon, it remained merely an offer, a dead letter, of no force whatever. It gave the king no rights in

²² For further examples see *Deutsche Zeitschrift f. Geschichtswissenschaft*, 1890, p. 327, where Scheffer-Boichorst has noted several similar examples.

Ireland; for only by the act of investiture could such rights be conveyed to him. Therefore, when he took possession of Ireland, he did so neither by virtue of the papal investiture nor by the papal offer of investiture. Henry II. got possession of Ireland *vi et armis*, and not as a fief but as an absolute possession. Neither Adrian nor Adrian's offer, as recorded by John of Salisbury, can in any way be made responsible for Henry's seizure of Ireland. And after he had taken forcible possession of it he tried, but without success, to persuade three successive popes to acknowledge the absolute character of his title to it.

When we ask why the investiture did not take place, we are left largely to conjecture. No one has given us a satisfactory reason for it. In the first place, the words of Robert de Torrigneio must be considered. He says that the opposition of the empress, Matilda, caused the invasion of Ireland to be put off. But did she oppose the offered investiture? We do not know. It is questionable whether her influence over Henry was sufficiently strong at that time to have been decisive in such a matter. However, Matilda had had personal experience in the great struggle about ecclesiastical investitures between the emperor and the popes, and she would probably have been able to advance good reasons for rejecting the pope's offer.

It must also be noted that Henry had not asked for investiture, but for the permission to invade and subjugate Ireland. In other words, he wished to become, not the feudal lord, but the absolute possessor of that land, and that he could become only by conquest. For some of his French possessions he was already the feudal subject of the king of France, with whom he was involved in constant quarrels. He knew that the feudal relation was burdensome and a most annoying hindrance to free and independent action. He had already begun his ambitious policy of concentrating the power in his own hands and of extending his authority. He may well therefore have shrunk from entering into another feudal relation which might easily become a still greater restriction and hindrance than the one in which he already found himself.

Possibly Henry was offended and frightened by the claim of the pope to be the possessor of all islands. For England also was an island. And if Henry should accept Ireland from the pope and thus recognize the claim of the latter to all islands, who was to assure him that the pope would not claim England in the same way and demand that Henry hold its crown also as a papal fief? Henry II. was clever, and it seems hardly possible that he or some of his advisers should not have seen the conclusion to which the claim of the pope logically led. It is possible, therefore, that he refused the investiture because he would not recognize the principle on which the pope's claims rested.

But there is another reason which seems to me even more probable and potent for his rejection of the offer of the pope. It must be noted that John of Salisbury does not speak of the conditions on which Adrian offered to invest Henry with the government of Ireland. But were there no conditions attached to it? Let us see. The relations existing between Adrian and Henry were not so intimate as to warrant the supposition that Adrian made the offer out of absolutely disinterested friendship.

Shall we listen to the supposition that it was out of the natural pride of an Englishman to be able to confer a favor on an English king? I regard the supposition as thoughtless and slanderous. There is nothing in Adrian's conduct or letters that would indicate that he was filled with the patriotic desire to see England's authority extended over her neighbors. There is no evidence that he labored out of patriotic motives to increase the power and prestige of the English king. There is no proof that he was inclined to favor his native land at the cost of St. Peter. He never was influenced in his papal policy by his nationality. As pope he labored for the whole church, not for the aggrandizement of a single power, even though it were his native country. He had a high, sane, and true conception of his office. Few popes have been more thoroughly imbued with what we may call the universal spirit of their office than was he. He was a fine exponent of the universal character of the papacy. From motives of simple friendship or of patriotism to have diminished the possessions of the church would have been to make the papacy subservient to particular and private ends. And that would have been malfeasance in office and treason to St. Peter. The whole pontificate of Adrian IV. shows that it would have been impossible for him to have acted in so treasonable a manner. The church had a tremendous transforming power. Witness Thomas à Becket.

Besides, speaking in the large, it has always been the papal policy to make concessions only when substantial concessions are made in return. *Do ut des, facio ut facias* is the unwritten law, the principle on which all popes act. And properly so, too; for the possessions of St. Peter should be used to advance his interests, and not to gratify the private and personal desires of the popes. If Adrian made a grant to Henry, he expected something in return. In other words, he attached some condition to his offer. In order to discover what this condition probably was, let us examine the following letter:

Adrianus E. s. s. D. Theobaldo Cantuariensi archiepiscopo apostolicae sedis legato s. e. a. b.
 Quanto magis sacrosancta Romana ecclesia te inter alios ecclesiarum paelatos ab ipso promotionis suae [*sic!* Read tuae] tempore honoravit, quanto et personam tuam maiori caritatis affectione dilexit, tanto amplius ei deberes in omni humilitate substerni, nec aliquid, quod ad eius contemptum vel incommodum pertineret, deceret te ulla tenus machinari. Quod enim in toto Anglico regno praerogativa solus nosceris obtinere quod vice nostra tibi aliorum errata permissum est emendare, quod eadem Romana ecclesia te non solum in partem vocavit sollicitudinis, verum etiam quadammodo (read quodammodo) in plenitudinem potestatis, oporteret te quandoque ad mentem reducere, et tantorum memoria praemiorum ab offensione nostra tuum deberet animum retardare. Miramur autem plurimum et gravamur, quod in oblivionem tot beneficiorum usque adeo devenisti, et collatam tibi a Romana ecclesia dignitatem ita videris abiecisse post tergum, quod cum ipsa te super alios exaltasset, tu eam, sicut rei effectus indicat, deprimere niteris, et robur virtutis eius, cui tamen nemo est qui posset resistere, praesumis modis omnibus enervare. Ad notitiam siquidem nostram, fama referente, pervenit, *quam ita apud te et apud regem Angliae appellatio sit sepulta, quod aliquis non est, qui in tua vel in illius presentia ad sedem apostolicam audeat appellare.* Sed numquam [numquid?] ad alterius institutionem principii contra edictum Dominicæ præceptionis aspiras. [?] Nunquam [numquid?] potestatem Petri et apostolicae fastigia dignitatis cogitas minorare, [?] Nunquam [numquid?] ad scissionem vestimentorum Christi, quae tamen scindi non possint, indebito conatu moliris. [?] Talem utique retributionem Deum non eredimus approbare, dum te ingratum nobis invenire pro

impensis beneficiis debeamus, et operibus nostris ita sinistre ita in contrarium respondere. Acedit etiam ad hoc, quod in exhibenda iustitia his qui iniustitiam patiuntur, tepidus sis modis omnibus ac remissus, *et in tantum parti regis diceris procurare favorem, eiusque timori succumbere*, quod si quando litteras tibi pro aliquo, ut suam consequatur iustitiam, destinemus, nullatenus poterit per te, sicut iam saepius ex multorum conquestione didicimus, quod suum est obtinere. Caeterum oporteret te magis Deo quam hominibus obediire, nec pro iustitia deberes aciem fugere gladiorum, nec laicorum saevitiam aut impetum formidare. Noveris autem quia si forte super his ad nos querela pervenerit iterata, *quod videlicet ne appellatio fiat ad nos audeas prohibere, vel ut prohibeatur silentio sustinere, seu quod, alienius timore in iustitia facienda tepidum te exhibeas et remissum in requisitum forsitan et in punctum* (So the editor Hardwick; it should apparently be *inquisitum forsitan et in punitum*) non poterimus praeterire. Ad hanc nosse te volumus, quod abbati s. Augustini, iuxta petitionem nuntiorum tuorum, declimus in mandatis, ut professionem tibi exhibeat, si canonice et legitime constiterit praedecessores eius ipsam professionem tuis antecessoribus praestitissem. Quod si hoc non esse constiterit, occasione litterarum illarum, professionem ab eo non audeas ulla violentia extorquere. Alioquin in fervore animi nostri, tam pro hoc quam pro caeteris praelibatis, et tuum candelabrum concutiemus, et tantam praeumptionem eum gravibus usuris, auctore Domino, exigemus.—*Data Beneventi X. Kal. Feb.* (January 23, 1156).

As is apparent, this is a letter of Adrian IV. to Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury. It has been published, with many errors, for some of which I have offered emendations, by Hardwick in his edition of Thomas Elmham's *Historia Monasterii s. Augustini Cantuariensis*, pp. 411 ff.

Adrian here recounts the high ecclesiastical honors which have been heaped on the archbishop and then upbraids him for his actions by which he is working injury to the Church. The king has forbidden the clergy of England to appeal to Rome, and the archbishop supports him in this iniquitous prohibition. It is apparent, therefore, that Henry had already begun the policy which was to culminate in the constitutions of Clarendon (1164) and the murder of Becket. He had begun to assume authority in ecclesiastical matters and had thereby given offense to the pope. Adrian threatens Theobald with deposition if he dares continue to prohibit appeals to Rome or silently permits them to be prohibited. But what would he say to Henry? Would such conduct in a king be passed over in silence?

From the date of this letter it is apparent that it was written at the very time when Henry's ambassadors were in Benevento to ask, among other things, for the pope's consent to the invasion of Ireland. The request was an impossible one, and certainly the pope would not be disposed to grant favors indiscriminately to a king who was usurping ecclesiastical authority, acting against the laws of the church, and oppressing the clergy by depriving them of their rights and liberties. The evil must be stopped. But Adrian IV. was not rash. Throughout his pontificate he resorted to extreme measures only with the greatest reluctance and after all other means had failed. The history of his negotiations with Frederick I. would abundantly prove this. He must have been searching for the means by which he could peaceably persuade Henry to change this policy so hostile to the church. And when he learned that Henry coveted Ireland, what more natural than that he should offer to invest him with

the government of the island, the possession of St. Peter, but on the condition that Henry change his policy and no longer interfere with the liberties of the church in England?

It is admitted that civil wars had been raging for some time in Ireland, and that the churches there were suffering from them. It was naturally to be hoped that a strong overlord, who, like Henry, was near at hand, would restore peace to the island. In the blessings of this peace the church would have no small share. Surely the cession of Ireland as a fief to the king of England would have been a small price to pay for the peace of Ireland and the consequent prosperity of the church there, and for the free exercise of the liberties of the church in England, which was so seriously threatened by the royal usurpations. Adrian IV. needs no justification for having made this offer.

And in such a feudal relation there was absolutely nothing derogatory or dishonoring to the Irish people. Europe, at that time, was feudal and thought in terms of feudalism. The feudal relation was the universal and natural one.

John of Salisbury, who stood in the favor of the king and was at the same time the secretary of Archbishop Theobald, foresaw the coming storm and hoped to avert it by persuading Adrian to this conciliatory offer, by which the king might be recalled to the path of obedience and justice. But the plan failed. Henry refused to accept the offered terms. His heart was set on acquiring the complete mastery over the church in England and on breaking down the authority of the pope there. And for the conquest of Ireland he could bide his time. Therefore he refused the investiture; he took no oath of homage and fidelity to the pope; he continued his policy of suppressing the liberties of the church; the ring, instead of being returned to the pope, went into the royal treasury, and the papal letter, now valueless, into the archives. John of Salisbury received scant reward for his pains. He could not do otherwise than resist the king's policy toward the church, and therefore he soon lost the royal favor. But the further progress of this great drama, as well as the later efforts of Henry II. to get possession of Ireland, and his negotiations with the successive popes on the same subject, lie beyond the scope of this study. But it is significant that in those negotiations the point of contention was the nature of Henry's claim to Ireland; he endeavored to secure papal recognition of his absolute possession of it, while the popes regarded it as the property of St. Peter, and Henry's tenure of it as feudal.

II. LAUDABILITER

We come now to an entirely different question. We have seen that Adrian IV. offered to invest Henry II. with Ireland; but is *Laudabiliter* the document by which he made the offer? It may or it may not be. The question must be examined and answered on its own merits. *Laudabiliter* must be subjected to all the tests to which an official mediæval document can be put. If it stands these tests, it is genuine; otherwise, it is false. If, on examination, *Laudabiliter* is found not to conform to the rules according to which all similar papal documents were drawn up; if it does not

accord with the statements of other unquestionably genuine writings which treat of the same subject; if, finally, it contains contradictions and other characteristic imperfections, we shall be compelled to say that it is not genuine. The trustworthiness of Giraldus Cambrensis, to whom we owe its preservation, has nothing to do with the question of its genuineness and should be left out of the discussion. It will be necessary, first of all, to study the document itself, and to this end I reproduce the text of it. It will be observed that certain of its sentences are repeated, either in whole or in part; and since this fact seems to me to be of some aid in determining the character of the document, they are printed in italics, and those which are identical or nearly so, are supplied with a common letter:

I. Adrianus servus servorum Dei earissimo in Christo filio illustri Anglorum regi s.e.a.b. Landabiliter satis et fruetuose de (a) gloriose nomine propagando in terris et (b) aeternae felicitatis praemio cumulando in caelis tua magnificentia cogitat, dum (c) ad dilatandos ecclesiae terminos, ad declarandam inductis et rudibus populis Christianae fidei veritatem, et (d) vitiorum plantaria de agro Domenico extirpanda, sicut eatholicus princeps intendis, et ad id convenientius exequendum, consilium apostolicae sedis exigis et favorem. In quo facto quanto altiori consilio et maiori discretione procedis, tanto in eo felieorem progressum te, praestante Domino, confidimus habitum; eo quod ad bonum exitum semper et finem soleant attingere, quae de ardore fidei et religionis amore principium acceperunt.

II. Sane Hiberniam et omnes insulas, quibus sol iustitiae, Christus, illuxit, et quae documenta fidei Christianae ceperunt, ad ies b. Petri et sacrosanctae Romanae ecclesiac, quod tua etiam nobilitas recognoscit, non est dubium pertinere. Unde tanto in eis libertius plantationem fidelem et germen gratum Deo inserimus, quanto id a nobis interno examine districtius prospiciimus exigendum.

III. Significasti siquidem nobis, fili in Christo earissime, te Hiberniae insulam ad subdendum illum populum legibus et (d) vitiorum plantaria inde extirpanda velle intrare, et de (e) singulis domibus annuum unius denarii b. Petro velle solvere pensionem, (f) et iura ecclesiistarum illius terrae illibata et integra conservare.

IV. Nos itaque, pium et laudabile desiderium tuum cum favore congruo prosequentes, et petitioni tuae benignum impendentes assensum, gratum et acceptum habemus, ut (c) pro dilatandis ecclesiae terminis, pro vitiorum restringendo decursu, pro corrugendis moribus et virtutibus inserendis, pro Christianae religionis augmento, insulam illam ingrediari, et quae ad honorem Dei et salutem illius terrae spectaverint exequaris, et illius terrae populus honorifice te recipiat, et sicut dominum veneretur, (f) iure nimirum ecclesiarum illibato et integro permanente et (e) satva b. Petro et sacrosanctae Romanae ecclesiae de singulis domibus annua unius denarii pensione.

V. Si ergo quod eoneepisti animo effectu duxeris prosequente complendum, stude gentem illam bonis moribus informare; et agas tam per te quam per illos, quos ad hoc fide, verbo, et vita, idoneos esse prospexeris, ut decoretur ibi ecclesia, plantetur et erescat fidei Christianae religio, et quae ad honorem Dei et salutem pertinent animarum per te taliter ordinentur ut a Deo (b) semipilvrae mercedis cumulum consequi merearis, et (a) in terris gloriosum nomen rakes in seculis obtinere.

The gist of this letter is found, I believe, in the following summary:

I. The king is taking praiseworthy means of spreading the glorious name (whose name?) in the earth and of laying up reward in heaven by laboring for the extension of the borders of the church, for the proclamation of the true faith to untaught and

uncultured peoples, and for weeding out the vices from the Lord's field, and by seeking the papal advice and favor in such labors. For, the deeper the counsel and the greater the discretion with which he proceeds, the greater will be his success in the undertaking. For whatever has its origin in religious zeal and devotion to religion always comes to a good and successful end.

II. Ireland, as well as all other islands which have received Christianity, belong to St. Peter. The pope is the more willing to sow the seed in these islands, because his conscience will demand of him a strict account of them.

III. The king has made known to the pope that he wishes to enter Ireland for the purpose of subjecting its people to laws and extirpating their vices; he is willing to pay St. Peter a penny each year for every house, and preserve intact the rights of the church there.

IV. The pope gives his consent to the plan and repeats and expands the conditions which have already been named. He is also willing that the Irish shall receive Henry as their lord.

V. If the king determines to carry his wish into effect let him strive to teach the Irish good morals, and let him and all those of whom he makes use in the undertaking so act that the church in Ireland may be adorned, the Christian religion be planted and have increase, and let him so dispose all things that pertain to the honor of God and to the salvation of souls that he may deserve a reward in heaven and forever have a glorious name in the earth.

It seems necessary to preface the discussion of this document with a brief statement about the rules and customs which prevailed in the papal *cancellaria* during the Middle Age. To the papal secretaries were given certain instructions which they must carefully and exactly follow in drawing up official documents. In consequence of the great stress laid on some of these rules they were so rigidly followed that they are unerring tests of genuineness and forgery. For it is agreed by all that a document which offends seriously against these rules can not have been written in the papal *cancellaria*, and if it purports to be a papal writing, it is declared to be a forgery. For a discussion of this subject, I refer to such handbooks as those of Bresslau and Leist.

By comparing *Laudabiliter* with the account of John of Salisbury, we discover the following three significant differences: First, John's statement that all islands belong to the pope was, as we have seen, in full agreement with the ideas of the times. But in *Laudabiliter* this theory receives a peculiar limitation; only those islands which have received Christianity are the possession of St. Peter. Secondly, it was a rule of the papal *cancellaria* that the person at whose request a favor was granted should be named in the document by which the favor was conferred or confirmed. John says that the gift was made *ad preces meas*. But there is no mention of this fact in *Laudabiliter*. Thirdly, there is not the slightest reference in *Laudabiliter* to the promised investiture of which John makes mention. But investiture was the most important thing of all, because without it a man could have no right to the fief in question. The rights to a fief could be conferred only by the act of investiture. And we search in

vain in *Laudabiliter* for the technical expressions *concessit et dedit* and *iure hereditario* which were used by John. There is here a radical defect in *Laudabiliter*. In paragraph II the pope is made to say that Ireland belongs to St. Peter, and in paragraph IV he merely gives his consent that Henry may invade Ireland and that the Irish may receive him with marks of honor and venerate him as their lord. Now, it is absolutely impossible that a fief should have been conferred by any one in the twelfth century by a document so vague and untechnical in its language. The conferring of a fief was a legal transaction of the utmost importance and was always done in technical language, and generally made more solemn by the emphatic heaping up of technical terms to indicate the absolute and unquestionable character of the grant. In such grants *damus*, *concedimus*, *donamus*, *auctorizamus*, *confirmamus*, and *investimus* are the words most frequently used. One has but to look into the documents of that period by which such grants were made to assure oneself that such technical terms were an essential part of every letter of grant. I have examined a large number of these grants, and not in one of them have I found such technical terms wanting. In fact, it is the rule to find at least two, and often even three or four, of these words used in every such document. The presence and repetition of these technical terms were quite as necessary and universal in official documents of the twelfth century as they are today in our deeds of grant. So essential were they to a transaction of this sort that John of Salisbury used them even though he was only making an untechnical statement of the fact.

Not less essential to such a document was the mention of the hereditary character of the grant. The heirs were always mentioned or it was explicitly said that the fief should return to its original owner on the death of the one to whom the grant is made.

That the papal secretaries were not ignorant of the necessity of such technical terms is apparent from the document which they drew up only a few weeks later (June, 1156), in which Adrian confirmed William of Sicily in the possession of his lands. (Watterich, *Vitae*, Vol. II, pp. 352-6. To avoid needless repetition, I simply refer to the passages from various documents quoted above in connection with the discussion of the technical terms, *concessit et dedit*.)

In view of the rigor with which such technical terms were used in documents of this sort in the Middle Age, there is but one conclusion possible. *Laudabiliter* cannot have been written by one who knew what was essential to such a document. It cannot have been written in the papal *cancellaria*, and, therefore, it is not genuine.

I should be willing to rest the case against *Laudabiliter* here in the full confidence that it would be condemned by all who are trained in the *res diplomaticae* of the Middle Age. But we may apply to it other tests by comparing it with the letters which Alexander III. wrote concerning Ireland. Three of these letters, numbered 12.162, 12.163, and 12.164 in the *Regesta* of Jaffé-Loewenfeld, are printed in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. CC, cols. 883 ff. They all bear the same date, September 20, and it is certain that they were written in 1172. In one of them, which is addressed to Henry II., the pope congratulates him on his success in Ireland, and closes with the following passage:

Et quia, sicut tuae magnitudinis excellentia (novit), Romana ecclesia aliud ius habet in insula quam in terra magna et continua, nos eam de tuae devotionis fervore spem fiduciamque tenentes, quod iura ipsius ecclesiae non solum conservare velis sed etiam ampliare, et ubi nullum ius habet, id debes sibi conferre, magnificentiam tuam rogamus et sollicite commoneamus ut in prescripta terra iura b. Petri nobis studeas sollicite conservare, et si etiam ibi non habet, tua magnitudo eidem ecclesiae eadem iura constitutat et assignet ita quod exinde regiae celsitudini gratias debeamus exsolvere copiosas, et tu primitias tuae gloriae et triumphi Deo videaris offerre. Data Tuseulan XII. Kal. Oct.

Alexander III. does not here name the *Donation*, but it is apparent that it was in his mind. The islands do not stand in the same relation to the pope as the mainland. Alexander expresses the confidence that Henry will be willing to acknowledge his duty, and therefore he beseeches him to preserve whatever rights St. Peter already actually exercises in Ireland, and to establish whatever other rights St. Peter ought to have there. In the whole letter there is no mention of Adrian IV., or of any document issued by him, touching Ireland. There is nothing that can possibly be interpreted as a reference to *Laudabiliter*.

Of the two other letters just referred to the one is addressed to the kings and princes of Ireland, urging them to keep their oaths to Henry II. The other is addressed to Christian, bishop of Lismore, who was then papal legate in Ireland, and to the four Irish archbishops and their suffragans. But in neither of these letters do we find any reference to Adrian IV. or to any of his letters.

From the letter to the Irish clergy I quote the following paragraph:

Ita mandatum nostrum fideliter et efficaciter exsecuturi ut sicut praefatus rex, tanquam catholicus et Christianissimus princeps, nos tam in decimis quam in aliis ecclesiasticis iustitiis vobis restituendis, et in omnibus quae ad ecclesiasticam pertinent liberatem, pie et benigne dicitur exaudisse, ita etiam vos sibi ea quae ad regiam respiciunt dignitatem conservetis firmiter et quantum vobis est, fæciatis ab aliis conservari.

Here there is mention made of tithes, but not a word about the payment of the Peter's pence which is spoken of in *Laudabiliter*. When we reflect that it was customary to refer to, and even to quote verbatim, the important sections of any papal document which had previously been issued touching the same subject, we must admit that these letters of Alexander III. give strong testimony against the genuineness of *Laudabiliter*.

But there is another letter attributed to Alexander III. in which Adrian IV. and his cession of Ireland to Henry II. are mentioned. This letter, which is brief and without date, I give entire:

Alexander e. s. s. D. earissimo in Christo filio, illustri Anglorum regi, s. e. a. b. Quoniam ea, quae a decessoribus nostris rationabiliter indulta noseuntur, perpetua merentur stabilitate firmari, venerabilis Adriani papæ vestigiis inherentes, vestrique desiderii fructum attendentes, concessionem eiusdem super Hibernie regni dominio vobis indulto, salva beato Petro et saecula sanctae Romanae ecclesiae sicut in Anglia sic et in Hibernia de singulis domibus annua unius denarii pensione, ratum habemus et confirmamus, quatinus, eliminatis terrae illius spurcitiis, barbara natio, quae Christiano censetur nomine, vestra diligentia morum induet venustatem, et redacta in formam hactenus informi finium illorum ecclesia, gens ea per vos Christianae professionis nomen cum effectu de cetero consequatur.

All our knowledge of this document is derived from Giraldus Cambrensis, who published it first in his *De Erpugnatione Hiberniae* (Book II, chap. 5, Vol. V, pp. 315 ff.), and again in his *De instructione Prin.* (Book II, chap. 19, Vol. VIII, p. 197). In the latter place, however, he prefaced it with the following statement: "Sicut a quibusdam impetratum asseritur aut configitur, ab aliis autem unquam impetratum fuisse negatur." That these early doubts about the genuineness of this letter were well founded will appear from the following considerations. The points of difference between this and the genuine letters of Alexander III., discussed above, are easily apparent. If all these letters are genuine, it would be difficult to explain these differences. In the time of Alexander III. it was a fixed rule of the papal *cancellaria* that all kings and princes should be addressed with *thou* and *Ihine* (*tu* and *tuis*). But the pope demanded that all should address him with *you* and *yours* (*vos* and *vestes*). Frederick I. and Adrian IV. had, indeed, a quarrel over this usage. Because the dignity of the pope and his claim to superiority over all princes and potentates were involved, this rule was of the utmost importance and was never broken in the papal *cancellaria*. Hence this cannot be a letter of Alexander III. Its author was evidently ignorant of the genuine letters of that pope, and so his writing does not agree with them. This false letter of Alexander III. has been quoted as a proof of the genuineness of *Laudabiliter*. But, being a forgery and agreeing with the terms of *Laudabiliter*, it furnishes, not a confirmation of, but good grounds for suspecting, the latter.

The arguments thus far advanced force upon us the conclusion that *Laudabiliter* is not genuine. Those that are yet to be brought forward have a double purpose: first, they are intended to add in a cumulative way to the force of the previous arguments; and, secondly, they are meant to reveal the true character of *Laudabiliter*. For this famous document is neither a genuine letter of Adrian IV. nor a forgery in the true sense of the word. It was not written with the purpose of deceiving or of securing any material advantage. The following arguments will, I hope, make it probable, if not absolutely certain, that it is merely a Latin exercise of some twelfth-century student, who was practicing himself in the art of letter-writing, and for this purpose chose to impersonate Adrian IV. It is well known that the composition of such imaginary correspondence formed a part of the training of students in the Middle Age.²³

To this conclusion we are led by a study of the style and phraseology of the letter. Its poverty of vocabulary, its numerous and awkward repetitions, its general haziness and indefiniteness, all reveal the untrained and uncertain hand of a student who is master neither of his materials nor of the proper literary forms. A reference to the sentences printed in italics will make any further discussion of this point unnecessary. A careful study of the letter will reveal the fact that it contains certain discrepancies of statement and logic. *Ad dilatandos ecclesiæ terminos* certainly implies that Ireland was outside of the limits of the church. *Ad declarandam indoctis et rudibus populis*

²³ See "Monachi Sangallensis de Gestis Karoli Imperatoris," I, 3 (M. G. SS., Vol. II, pp. 731 f.) for evidence that it was the practice in the days of Karl the Great.

Christiana fidei veritatem apparently has the same meaning. But Ireland, as we have seen, was Christian and possessed a complete ecclesiastical organization, recognized and, in part, created by the pope. And our student was aware of this fact because in paragraph IV he speaks of the church as if it already existed there, *ut decoretur ibi ecclesia*. And, according to paragraph II, Ireland must have been Christian, because only Christian islands are said to belong to St. Peter. And yet in the next sentence the pope is made to speak of sowing the seed in such islands as if they were still heathen.

Not less striking is the contradiction or lack of logical coherence in two sentences in paragraph I: "*The deeper the counsel and the greater the discretion with which you proceed, the greater will be your success.*" This is a rational statement and needs no further proof. But it is followed by a statement that, absurdly enough, has exactly the opposite meaning: "*Because whatever has its origin in zeal for religion and the love of the faith always succeeds.*" The presence of such contradictions and such lack of clearness and precision in statement are easily explained if this letter is only a student's exercise.

We know also that this student had before him a genuine letter of Adrian IV. from which he borrowed several sentences, adapting them, badly and in an awkward way, to suit his purpose. Toward the end of the year 1158 or early in the year 1159, Henry II. and Louis VII. of France planned to make a campaign together against the Mohammedans in Spain. They sent a common embassy to Adrian IV. setting forth their desire and asking the pope's consent. But Adrian, for reasons into which we need not enter here, refused to sanction the undertaking. The embassy naturally received two letters in reply, the one addressed to Louis VII., the other to Henry II. The former has been preserved, the latter lost. Knowing the customs of the papal *cancellaria*, we may say with certainty that in their essential parts touching the matter in hand these two letters were practically identical in everything except the names of the persons addressed. The letter addressed to Henry had no value to him, and was therefore not carefully preserved. In some way it fell into the hands of our student. In order to show how he utilized it in the composition of *Laudabiliter*, I quote the following extracts from the pope's letter to Louis VII:

Adrianus e. s. s. D. carissimo in Christo filio Ludovico, illustri Francorum regi s. e. a. b.
Satis laudabiliter et fructuose de Christiano nomine propagando in terris, et aeternac beatitudinis
praemio tibi cumulando in caelis, tua videtur magnificentia cogitare, dum ad dilatandos terminos
populi Christiani, ad paganorum barbariem debellandam, et ad gentes apostatrices, et quae
catholicae fidei refugiant nec recipient veritatem, Christianorum iugo et dilectione subdendos etc.
.... atque ad id convenientius exsequendum, matris tuae sacrosanctae Romanae ecclesiae con-
silium exigis et favorem. Quod quidem propositum tanto magis gratum acceptumque tenemus,
et amplius sicut commendandum est commendamus, quanto de sinceriori caritatis radice talem
intentionem et votum tam laudabile credimus processisse, ac de maiore ardore fidei et religionis
amore propositum et desiderium tuum principium acceperunt.

The changes made in transferring and adapting these sentences to *Laudabiliter* are apparent. The order of the words is somewhat varied; *Christiano* becomes *glorioso*; *beatitudinis felicilatis*, etc. But, while the sentences are logical, sensible, and appropriate

in their original setting in Adrian's letter to Louis, they become absurd and contradictory when transferred to *Laudabiliter*. *Ad dilutandos terminos populi Christiani* is quite properly used in the letter to Louis, because it refers to those parts of Spain which were held by the Mohammedans. But it could not by any means be applied to Ireland. Nor is it strange if the Irish have always refused to accept as genuine a document which described them in terms borrowed from an account which had originally applied to Mohammedans.

Adrian expresses his satisfaction with Louis because his "plan and desire have their origin in his zeal for religion and his love for the faith." Here these words are sane and fit into the reasoning. And yet the pope considers the proposed expedition against the Mohammedans ill-advised and not likely to succeed for reasons named later in the letter. We have already seen how badly this sentiment is fitted into the chain of reasoning and its new setting in *Laudabiliter*. As it there stands, it is not only contradictory to the reasoning of Adrian in his letter to Louis; it is also an affront to his intelligence and good sense. For Adrian IV. was neither a dreamer nor an enthusiast.

That the style of *Laudabiliter* gave offense is apparent from the fact that later copyists endeavored to improve upon it. Changes were introduced into its text which can be explained in no other way. The uncertainty as to whose name is meant in paragraph I was removed by inserting *luo*. In the clause *ad subdendum illum populum legibus* it is uncertain what laws are meant. They might be the laws of England or those of the church. The later insertion of *Christianis* before *legibus* made the meaning definite. The absurdity of the statement "*eo quod ad bonum exitum semper et finem soleant attingere, que de ardore fidei et religionis amore principium acceperunt*," was evidently felt, because the whole sentence in which it is found was later omitted. The same fate was meted out to the sentence, "*Unde tanto in eis libentius plantationem fidelem et germen gratum Deo inserimus*," etc., because it was in plain contradiction to the well-known fact that Ireland was already Christian. Paragraph II was transferred to a place further on in the document, and also radically modified, principally because it seemed not to be in its most logical position. It is surely significant that it is these borrowed sentences, all of which have been discussed in former paragraphs, that gave offense to later copyists.

I believe, therefore, that *Laudabiliter* is the Latin exercise of a mediæval student. It can have no official value. It may contain some truth: with that I am not particularly concerned here. However, since its author did not have before him the real letter of Adrian IV. to which John of Salisbury alludes, it seems to me unwarrantable to attach any importance to what it says about the payment of the Peter's pence. It is true that it was then a part of the papal policy to extend the custom of the payment of Peter's pence. But Alexander III. did not mention it in connection with Ireland in 1172. Moreover, Adrian would probably have been content with the change which he demanded in the policy of Henry toward the church. *Laudabiliter* cannot be regarded as a trustworthy source of information on any point. It must be rejected as entirely worthless.

III. THE SUPPOSED LETTER OF HENRY II. TO ADRIAN IV.

It seems very strange to me that in connection with this question no one has ever critically examined a certain extant letter which is said to have been written by Henry II. to Adrian IV. at the time of the accession of the latter to the chair of St. Peter. It has been taken for granted that it is the letter which Henry's messengers bore to the pope on their mission which has been discussed in part II of this study. Historians have made use of it without question, although some of them have expressed a mild surprise at its contents, which are not in the least in keeping with the character of its reputed royal author. Critical study of it has convinced me that it also is a student's exercise. In the text, which follows, the rhythmical endings, of which I wish to speak later, are printed in italics, the most important examples of puns and alliteration, and certain other matters worthy of special attention, are in small capitals. I have taken it from Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. CCVII, *Petri Blesensis Epistolae*, in which collection it is numbered CLXVIII.

TALI PAPAE TALIS REX

I. AURES nostras AURA dulcis afflavit, quia, sicut accepimus, creationis vestrae novitas tanquam aurora rutilans desolationis Romanae Ecclesiae tenebras *propulsavit*. GAUDET sedes Apostolica viduitatis suae *solatum consecuta*. GAUDENT omnes ecclesiae lucem novam oriri videntes, et ipsam usque ad perfectam diem *crescere praeitolantes*. Sed GAUDET praecipue noster Occidens, quod velut Oriens novum lumen influere *promeruit orbis terrae*, et solem Christianitatis, qui versus Orientem nuper occubuit, divino munere, *Ocidens restauravit*. Nos itaque, Pater Sancte, honori vestro MAGNIFICE *collactantes* et divinae MAJESTATIS MAGNIFICENTIAM devotis inde laudibus *perseguentes* paternitati vestrae, de cuius fervore filiali devotione confidimus, vota nostra familiarius aperimus. Si enim carnis filius carnales affectus patri fidenter aperit, quanto fidentius spiritualis *spiritualia potest desideria reservare?*

Sane inter caeteras affectiones nostras non *mediocriter affectatus*, quod cum divina dextera reverendissimam personam vestram, tanquam lignum vivificum in medio Paradisi spiritualiter plantandum duxerit, et de terra nostra in suum *pomoerium transplantandum* summopere studeatis fructuosis operibus et doctrinis ecclesias omnes ita reficere, quod beatam dicant omnes generationes vestrae *beatitudinis nationem*. Illud quoque sincero corde sitimus, quod spiritus procellarum, qui dignitatum culmina vehementius consuevit perlare, nunquam a sanctitatis studio vos a^rellat ne, quid absit, altius dignitatis fastigium, gravius *praecepitum subsequatur*.

II. Sed et illud *in fine affectamus*, ut cum UNIVERSARUM ECCLESiarum ORDINATIO AD VOS PERTINEAT, tales ordinare curetis sine dilationis *dispendio cardinales* qui onus vestrum sciant, et velint et *raleant supplicare*, non respicientes ad patriae propinquitatem, *generis qualitatem* aut *potentiae quantitatem*, sed quod Deum timeant, avaritiam odiant, iustitiam sitiant, et zelo ferveant animarum.

III. Nec modicum nostrum movet affectum ut, cum ecclesiis supra modum officiat *indignitas ministrorum*, summa sollicitudine vigilare curetis, cum super dignitatum vel praebendarum collatione vestram contingat requiri providentiam, ne quis indignus irruat in *patrimonium Crucifixi*.

IV. Cum autem FELIX terrena, FELICIS redemptionis origine, conversatione, ac sanguine Christi conserata, quam Christiana devotio praecipue venerari tenetur, tantis, SICUT OCCULATA FIDE NOVISTIS, perturbatur nationum incursiis, abominationibus polluitur, desiderio desideramus quod ad ipsius liberationem vestrae sollicitudinis vires accingatis.

V. Illud autem olim illustre imperium Constantinopolitanum NUNC GRAVITER DESOLATUM, quis affectare non debeat, ut, vestra providente prudentia, consolationem *recipiat opportunam?*

VI. Siquidem et honoris vestrae considerationis [so Migne, but the text evidently should be, honoris vestri consideratione] et communeditatis communis aemulatione affectare debemus, ut qui promotione divina universalis praesidetis Ecclesiae, circa omnium ecclesiarum INFORMATIONEM ac REFORMATIONEM "assidue vigiletis."

VII. Confidimus autem in Domino, et speramus quod sicut de virtute in virtutem, et de honore in honorem divinitus sublimati secundum ipsorum exigentiam lucere curastis, sie ad Apostolicae sublimitatis *apicem evocati* subjectas ecclesias illustrare ac inflammare curabitis, ut non sit qui se absecurat a vestro *lumine et calore*, relicturi talia post decessum vestrum *vestigia sanctilialis* quod terra nativitatis vestrae, quae de FELICI iucundatur origine, de FELICE FINE poterit FELICIVS in *Domino gloriari*.

VIII. Demum Paternitatem vestram ex speciali confidentia *requirimus et rogamus* quatenus nos et familiares nostros, et statum regni nostri in sermonibus et orationibus vestris specialiter habere *dignemini commendatis*.

In the first place, the use of the *cursus velor*, or the rhythmical ending not only of the sentences, but even of the clauses, in a royal document of England, in that period is, I believe, otherwise unknown. The *cursus velox* consists of a daecyl followed by two trochees. Or, since it is a matter of accent and not of quantity, it would be more correct to say that the first foot consists of an accented, followed by two unaccented, syllables, and the two other feet consist, each, of an accented, followed by an unaccented, syllable. This *cursus velox* characterizes all the papal documents of that period, but I have not been able to find a single example of its use in any of the documents belonging to the early years of the reign of Henry II. Peter of Blois, in whose writings it is used not infrequently, did not become connected with the English court until about the year 1170.²⁴

Not too much importance should be attached to the fact that the names of both the king and of the pope are wanting, because, of course, a lazy scribe may have wished to cut short his labors by omitting them. And yet it is not likely that the names of two so important men as Henry II. and Adrian IV. would have been omitted from such a letter; all the more so because a superscription of the most general character has been added: *Tali Papae talis rex*; that is, "King So-and-so to Pope So-and-so;" or translating it in accordance with its formula-like character, "Any king to any pope." Moreover, there is nothing in the letter to indicate that it was written by an *English* king. It is couched in the vaguest terms. There is no mention of a particular country, nothing in fact that would not apply equally well to any western country. The king and the pope to whom he is writing are fellow countrymen, and it is vaguely indicated that their country is somewhere in the West; that is all that can be said.

Furthermore, Henry II. is said to have recommended his messengers and

²⁴ For a good discussion of the *cursus* see NOËL VALOIS, "Étude sur le rythme des bulles pontificales," *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes*, Vol. XLII (1881), pp. 161 ff. and 257 ff.; also *Analecta Bollandiana*, 1897, pp. 501 ff., and 1898, pp. 386 ff., where a good list of the literature on the subject is given; BRESSLAU, *Urkundenlehre*, Vol. I, pp. 530 ff.

Although there are several varieties of *cursus*, the schemes of the three most important are as follows: *cursus planus*, 2uu | 2u, e.g., *dona concedi*; *cursus tardus*, 2uu | 2uu, e.g., *praestat auxilium*; *cursus velox*, 2uu | 2u | 2u, e.g., *crescere praeostolantes*.

especially the monastery of St. Albans to the favor of the pope and to have made certain definite requests, among others, for permission to invade Ireland. But of all these things there is not a word in this letter. It could hardly have been made more general, impersonal, and colorless.

And now for the contents of the letter.

I. After long and cumbersome expressions of the general joy at the election of a new pontiff, the writer expresses his desire that the new pope may strive so to restore all the churches with his good works and doctrines that all generations may call his native land blessed; and may the troubles of his pontificate never separate him from the zeal of sanctity.

II. And since the control and management of all the churches belong to the pope, let him, without delay, create cardinals of such a character that they will be able and willing to carry his burden.

III. Since an unworthy clergy is a hindrance to the churches, let him watch with great care that no unworthy person may receive from him an ecclesiastical dignity or living.

IV. The pope is urged to gird himself up for the reconquest of the Holy Land, that is, to make a crusade.

V. There is a general desire that the pope should give aid to the Greek empire, once so illustrious, but now woefully devastated.

VI. For the sake of the pope's own good name and renown, and for the advancement of the common welfare, the pope ought to labor for the reformation of all the churches.

VII. The hope is expressed that the pope will extend his beneficial influence to the farthest limits of the church, and that he will, when he dies, leave behind him such proofs of his piety that his fellow-countrymen may rejoice over his happy end.

VIII. And finally the pope is asked to remember in his conversations and prayers the king, his family, and his kingdom.

This is really a complete general program for the new pope, consisting of three great lines of activity: a complete reformation of the clergy and of the church, the making of a crusade, and the restoring of the Greek empire. Surely that would be enough work for any one pontificate.

In discussing these contents I pass by, for the present, the first paragraph. In the beginning of the second paragraph it is said that the control and management of all the churches belong to the pope. *Universarum ecclesiarum ordinatio ad vos pertinet.* The thought of the sixth paragraph is very similar. But Henry II. had, as we have just seen, already begun to deny this principle; he had forbidden appeals to Rome and was interfering with the liberties of the church in England. And he persisted in this course for the next fifteen years. Not even in a congratulatory letter would he have recognized so fully the validity of a principle which he was resisting with all his might and which he was determined at all hazards to destroy in his own land.

The writer's solicitude about the character of the cardinals and of those who

should receive the offices and dignities of the church (Paragraphs II and III) would be absurdly hypocritical in Henry II., who preferred a worldly clergy that could be made to serve his own ends. The interest expressed in having a crusade (Paragraph IV) would be not less preposterous in Henry II., who was at that time engaged with all his energies in his own aggrandizement and in increasing the power of the crown. There was no one in Europe at that time more unwilling to go on a crusade than was Henry II.

What he is made to say about the condition of the Greek empire is contrary to the state of facts at that time. Not only was the Greek empire not *graviter desolatum*; it had successfully resisted the invasions of the Normans only a few years before this, and it was at that very moment invading southern Italy with victorious arms. The emperor, Manuel, was then following with determination, and with a fair prospect of success, the policy of obtaining possession of certain parts of Italy. Instead of needing the papal aid, the Greek emperor was actually threatening the possessions of the pope. In fact, in that very year, 1155, Adrian IV. and Frederick I. of Germany had renewed the agreement of Constance by the terms of which they had mutually bound themselves not to cede any land in Italy to the Greek emperor, and to resist him with all their might if he should attempt to secure it by invasion.²⁵ It must be observed that this Greek danger had been threatening the papacy for some years. To have written such a letter to the pope at this time would indicate a degree of ignorance of the world's doings that certainly did not exist at the English court.

If we turn to a consideration of the style and language of the letter, we find many things that betray the hand of a tyro. The puns are weak and the alliteration strained and excessive. *Aures-aura, magnifice-maiestatis-magnificentiam, velint-valeant, informationem-reformationem, illustrare-inflammare, felici-felici-fine-felicius.* These examples may suffice, but the list could be greatly increased. The poverty of the writer's vocabulary as well as his strange phraseology are not less indicative of his lack of skill and training. *Affectare* and its derivatives are made to do yeoman service. *Gaudere* and *sitire* fare but little better. If the letter was addressed to Adrian IV. when, it may be asked, had he seen with his own eyes the abominations with which the Holy Land was polluted? *Sicut occulata fide novistis.* Was the pope ever before called the "Sun of Christianity"? And what is the meaning of that confused sentence, "*Sed gaudet praecipue noster Occidens, quod velut Oriens novum lumen influere promeruit orbi terrae, et solem Christianitatis, qui versus Orientem nuper occubuit, divino munere, Occidens restauravit?*" Does it mean that the West is rejoicing

²⁵ Their mutual promises were as follows: "Grecorum quoque regi nullam terram ex ista parte maris [Fridericus] concedet; quodsi forte ille invaserit pro viribus regni, quantocius poterit, ipsum eicere curabit . . . Regi autem Grecorum ex ista parte maris terram [papa] non concedet; quodsi ille invadere presumserit, dominus papa viribus beati Petri cum eicere curabit." This agreement of Constance had first been made between Eugene III. and Frederick I., in March, 1153. The text of it is found in *Wibaldi Epistolae*, No. 417, JAFFE, *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum*, Vol. I, pp. 546 f., and in *M. G. Leges*, Vol. II, pp. 92 f. The text of the renewal between Adrian IV. and Frederick

I. is to be found in the "Rouleaux de Cluny," edited by HUILLARD-BRÉHOLLES, in *Notices et extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale* (Paris, 1868), Vol. XXI, pp. 319 ff. For a discussion of the agreement and of its renewal, see PRUTZ, *Kaiser Friedrich I.*, Vol. I, pp. 47 f.; GIESEBRECHT, *Geschichte der Deutschen Kaiserzeit*, Vol. V, pp. 24 f.; KAP-HERR, *Abendländische Politik Kaiser Manuels*, pp. 42 f.; ZEPPELEIN, *Der Konstanzer Vertrag* ("Schriften des Vereins für die Geschichte des Bodensees," Vol. XVI, pp. 30 f.); JUNGFER, *Untersuchungen über Friedrichs I. griech. und norman. Politik*, pp. 9 f.; RIBBECK, *Friedrich I. und die römische Curie*, pp. 3 ff.

because it has furnished a pope or because of its success in a crusade? The context demands the former, the words themselves appear to have the latter, meaning. I suspect that the writer, who, I take it, was a student preparing a Latin exercise for his *magister* to correct, had found in some chronicle an account of a crusade in which the Occident and Orient were set over against each other, and he was so pleased with the idea that he tried to incorporate some of its sentences into his exercise, but failed to adapt them to their changed setting and purpose.

I have pointed out the most glaring mistakes and absurdities in the letter; a more extended study of it would bring others to light. But surely enough has been done to prove even to the most skeptical that the letter cannot have been written by Henry II. to Adrian IV. Indeed, there is nothing in the letter itself to indicate this authorship, and it seems to me that someone has hastily and without really studying it attributed it to Henry II. Who this was I cannot say. In the first edition of the letters of Peter of Blois (Paris, 1516), this letter is quite anonymous. Neither in the edition of Migne is its author or the pope to whom it is addressed named. The descriptive summary by which Migne has prefaced it is as follows: "Rex quidam sibi totique Occidenti gratulatur, quod N ex ipsius terra ad summum pontificatum pervenerit, eumque hortatur, ut dignos tantum ad dignitates ecclesiasticas promoveat." The editions by de Gussanville and by Giles I have not been able to consult, and therefore cannot say how they have regarded it. So far as I can see, about the only thing that could be urged in favor of Henry's authorship is the fact that it is found among the letters of Peter of Blois. It is, of course, superfluous to say that this circumstance carries with it no proof of its authorship.

As to the time when this exercise was actually written, nothing can be said with certainty. Assuming that the student put into it the background of his own day, there are certain indications of its age. The insistence on a reform of all the churches, the implied censure of the cardinals and of the ecclesiastical dignitaries and of the beneficed clergy seem to me to accord a little better with the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries than with the twelfth and thirteenth. But the criticism is general, and a conclusion based on that alone would be very insecure. The reference to the desolate condition of the Greek empire might apply either to the destruction of the so-called Latin kingdom (1261) or, more probably, to the effects of the Turkish invasions in the fourteenth and fifteenth-centuries.

An examination of the manuscripts in which this letter is found would fix the latest date at which it can have been written. If it should be found to exist only in the more recent of them, that would tend toward a confirmation of the late date to which I have tentatively assigned it. Manuscripts containing the letters of Peter of Blois are very numerous and widely scattered. Hardy (*Catalogue*, etc., Vol. II, pp. 553 ff.) has registered nearly one hundred of them, but his list is far from being complete. I regret that I have not been able to make a complete list of them and to examine all of them. I have, however, examined about sixty of them, but without success. I have not been able to find the letter in question in any of them.

I give here a list of those manuscripts, containing letters of Peter of Blois, which I have examined:

In the Vatican Library: Vat. 2931, 2973; Pal. 1460; Ottob. 614, 3008; Reg. Suec. 53, 136, 263. Biblioteca Barberiniana, XIV, 56.

In the k. und k. Hof-Bibliothek in Vienna: Nos. 559, 941, 3330, 3340, 3368, 3419, 3444, 3706, 4159, 4245, 4790, 4994, 12503, and 13538.

In the Kloster-Bibliothek in Admont, one manuscript.

My thanks are due Count Carlo Cipolla, Professor in Turin, who kindly examined a manuscript (No. 675) for me in the library at Turin.

In the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, M. Lebègue kindly examined for me the following list: Fonds Latin, Nos. 2604, 2605, 2607-2610A inclusive, 2836, 2953-2962 inclusive, 3309, 5372, 7717, 16251, 16252, 16714, 16715, 11867, 13420, 14169-14171 inclusive, 14486, 14764, 14879, 18587, 18588; and Nouvelles Acquis. Latines, No. 2243.

It may not be out of place to add that the literature about such students' exercises and imaginary correspondence is quite extensive. There are numerous monographs on single collections of formularies in which such letters are found. I content myself by referring only to the following as typically characteristic and in themselves interesting: Wattenbaeh, "Ueber Briefsteller des Mittelalters," *Archiv für österr. Geschichte*, Vol. XIV, pp. 60 ff.; also, "Ueber erfundene Briefe in Hss. d. Mittelalters, bes. Teufelsbriefe," *Sitzungsbericht d. k. pr. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1892, pp. 91 ff. For famous examples of such letters, see Scheffer-Boichorst, *Zur Geschichte d. XII. u. XIII. Jahrh.*, pp. 290 ff., and Wagner, *Eberhard II. Bischof von Bamberg*, pp. 120 ff.

IV. A LETTER OF GERHOH OF REICHERSBERG TO ADRIAN IV. (1156) ENTITLED LIBER DE NOVITATIBUS HUIUS TEMPORIS

Among the leading clergy of Germany in the twelfth century Gerhoh of Reichersberg holds a conspicuous place. He was born in 1093 or 1094, in the village of Polling in Bavaria. After various fortunes he was, in 1132, made praepositus of the monastery of Regular Canons at Reichersberg on the Inn, a position which he held until his death in 1169.

Gerhoh had a very fertile pen and took a prominent part in the discussion of all the questions, great and small, that agitated his day. He lived to see the contest between papacy and empire pass through some of its most critical phases and suffered deeply from this great struggle. He was sincerely attached to both institutions and longed to see them working harmoniously together for the realization of certain great ideals of which he was possessed. He was, however, unsparing in his criticism of both. He never wearied of making proposals of reform and, unasked, gave his advice to the pope on all matters, whether of policy or doctrine. In theology he was rigidly orthodox and seemed to believe that the last word had been said on all the theological questions. He had formed his own ideas by the study of the great church fathers, especially Augustine and Hilary, and vigorously combated every shade of opinion that did not accord with the teachings of these his favorite authorities. The twelfth century was fruitful in new ideas, and Gerhoh was kept busy refuting them and their authors, the innovations and innovators, as he styled them.

The twelfth century witnessed a revival of classical studies—the real beginning of the Renaissance, it may be said—and some of the clergy, chief of whom was John of Salisbury, were thoroughly conversant with the Latin classics and took so great delight in them that they constantly quoted them in their writings. But Gerhoh, in his culture, was thoroughly mediæval. He seems to have been ignorant of the classics; at least, one searches in vain in his writings for quotations from them. Instead of the classics, he reveled in quotations from the Bible and from the church fathers. In fact, at times his works seem to be little more than mosaics made from these sources. And often, even when he does not cite an author by name, his thought and phraseology are borrowed from some father.

In Germany Gerhoh occupied much the same place and played the same rôle as Bernard of Clairvaux in France. He greatly admired Bernard and made free use of his writings, quoting them and recommending them to the perusal of others. And, like Bernard, he was thoroughly imbued with the monastic spirit of his day and labored to subject all the secular clergy to monastic discipline. According to his ideas, there could be no good priest who did not live by a monastic rule. For him no argument was necessary to prove that a secular priest was immoral. The mere fact that he did not live with his fellow priests in a common house and in subjection to a common rule was enough to condemn him.

Gerhoh had formed the habit of offering advice to the popes, and so, when Adrian IV. was elected, Gerhoh sent off a letter to him at once, dispatching it by Eberhard II., the bishop of Bamberg. This letter, however, which is now lost, remained unanswered, and Gerhoh felt somewhat hurt at the pope's silence. He accordingly wrote him another letter, exhibiting here and there in it his sense of injury. It is this second letter to Adrian that is here published. With a certain show of boastfulness he tells Adrian that his predecessors in the chair of St. Peter had been his friends and makes quite a display of the papal letters which he had at various times received. This letter, as its title indicates, was a general account of all the heresies and abuses in the church, and was intended to incite Adrian to the work of reform. The letter was begun probably toward the end of 1155 and completed early in the following year. It was dispatched by his brother Rudiger, who, no doubt, put it into the hands of the pope, whom he found at Benevento discussing the terms of peace with William of Sicily (May–June, 1156). But Gerhoh was no more successful with this than he had been with his first letter, for Adrian IV. did not reply to it. Gerhoh later complained of this neglect, and was at a loss to account for it. However, he offered as an excuse for it the fact that Adrian was no doubt busy with the affairs of his office. He was unwilling to believe that the pope was not well disposed toward him. In this Gerhoh was probably correct, for Adrian was engrossed with far more important matters. Questions of policy involving the future of the papacy were pressing for solution, and Adrian's pontificate was troubled by frequent quarrels with the emperor, which served as preludes to the great struggle which followed hard upon his death and filled the long pontificate of his successor, Alexander III.

The text of this letter is here presented in its entirety for the first time. Grisar published brief extracts from it in the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, Vol. IX (1885), pp. 536 ff., and Sackur edited and published selections from it (about one-fifth of the letter), along with other of Gerhoh's works, in the third volume of the *Libelli de Lite Imperatorum et Pontificum*. My interest was awakened in the letter while gathering materials for the life of Adrian IV., and I determined to publish it entire. It is preserved in a manuscript of the twelfth century, in the monastic library at Admont. The manuscript is of parchment in quarto. It is generally well written, although by several different hands. The letter occupies 165 pages of the manuscript, or rather only 163, since, through the error of the one who first numbered the pages, the numbers 131 and 151 were omitted.

The work of copying the manuscript was made easy for me by the kindness of Professor E. Mühlbacher, who had the manuscript sent to Vienna and with the greatest generosity placed the rooms of the Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung at my disposal, so that I was able to copy it with the greatest comfort and at my leisure. I wish to thank Professor Mühlbacher, as well as other members of the Institut, for their kindness and courtesy.²⁶

LIBER DE NOVITATIBUS HUIUS TEMPORIS

Ad te, Romane pontifex Adriane, patrem et dominum meum loquar, cum sim pulvis et cinis, ausu loquendi non temerario, sed, ut arbitror, necessario. Denique in hoc tempore apostolatus tui non solum flumina secularis concupiscentie regnantis in clero absque regulis tam synodalibus quam cenobitalibus conversante illiduntur domui Dei supra petram fundate,¹ Petro commisse, sed et ventorum nimius impetus ipsa domus huius fundamenta per quorundam ventosam loquacitatem subvertere nititur. Et quidem contra insanias clericorum seculariter ac plusquam laicaliter luxuriantium et gratiam Domini transferentium in suas luxurias, dum perverse consumunt facultates ecclesiasticas, iam saluberrima decreta promulgata sunt in conciliis ac decretis praedecessorum tuorum clericos incestuosos² et ambitiosos dampnificant et interdicit, *quorum crimina manifesta sunt precedentia ad iudicium*,³ ita ut eos accusari ac testibus convineat non sit magis necessarium quam fornicatorem illum publicum, quem Paulus apostolus iudicavit non tam examinandum quam dampnaudum et quasi vetus fermentum expurgandum.⁴ (2) Que nimurum decreta, si manciparentur effectui contra illisiones fluminum domui Dei, sicut appareat illisque satis utiliter esset consultum.⁵ Super quibus aut effectui mancipandis aut eorum praevaricatoribus et neglectoribus digne castigandis memini a mea parvitate directam epistolam, quam et cognovi per dominum Babenbergensem⁶ sancto apostolatu

²⁶ For Gerhoh and his works and life the following literature may be consulted: STÜLZ, "Probst Gerhoh I. von Reichersberg," in *Denkschriften der Wiener Akademie, phil-hist. Kl.*, Vol. I, pp. 113 ff.; BACH, "Probst Gerhoh I. von Reichersberg," in *Oesterr. Vierteljahrsschrift für kath. Theologie*, Vol. IV (1865), pp. 19 ff.; NOBBE, "Gerhoh von Reichersberg," Leipzig, 1881; RIBBECK, "Gerhoh von Reichersberg und seine Ideen über das Verhältniss zwischen Staat und Kirche," *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, Vol. XXIV, pp. 1 ff., and Vol. XXV, pp. 556 ff.; GRISAR, "Die Investiturfrage nach umgedruckten Schriften Gerhoh's," *Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie*, Vol. IX (1885), pp. 536 ff.; SCHEIBELBERGER, *Opera omnia Gerhohi*, Linzii, 1875; also in *Oesterr. Vierteljahrsschrift für kath. Theologie*, Vol. X (1871), pp. 565 ff.; STURMHÖFEL, *Der geschichtliche*

Inhalt von Gerhoh's von Reichersberg erstem Buche über die Erforschung des Antichrists, Leipziger Programm, 1887; also, *Gerhoh über die Sittenzustände der zeitgenössischen Geistlichkeit*, Programm der Thomas Schule, Leipzig, 1888; SACKUR, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Libelli de Lite Imperatorum et Pontificum*, Vol. III, pp. 131 ff.

¹ Matt. 7:25, 16:18. In the MS. *ω* is often indicated by an *e* with a cedilla; in the printed text this is represented by *e*, or, if occurring in italicised passages, by *e*.

² Married clergy are included as well as those living with concubines.

³ 1 Tim. 5:24. ⁴ 1 Cor. 5:5 ff. ⁵ *Libelli*, consultum.

⁶ Eberhard II., bishop of Bamberg, 1116-70; cf. WAGNER, *Eberhard II.*, p. 90.

tuo praesentatam, enius initium fuit: *Tu es qui venturus es an alium expectamus?*¹ Exspectamus enim sicut illie partim significavimus, partim prudentie tue per se animadvertisendum reservavimus, talem sedis apostolice antistitem, cui videlicet velut alteri Iosue dicat Dominus: *Confortare et esto robustus; tu enim introduces populum meum in terrum lacte et mette manantem.*² Talem terram in suis decretis Innocentius et Eugenius³ egregii predecessores tui quasi Moyses et Aaron praeostenderunt, sed morte praeventi non introierunt neque introduxerunt populum Dei in eam, non valentes in diebus suis effectui mancipare que statuerant de concubinariis et conducticis abicieendis, de falsis penitentiis cavendis, de incendiariis puniendis, de clericis disciplinandis, de sanctimonialibus claustrali custodie⁴ mancipandis, de treuga servanda et de ceteris (3) ad decorum domus Dei pertinentibus novasque abusiones competenter medicantibus. Quia ergo *verbum de ore Dei* per Petri successores *egressum non revertetur ad eum vacuum, sed faciet quicumque voluit et prosperabitur in his ad que missum est,*⁵ pusille fidei⁶ arguendi sumus, nisi mandata sedis apostolice salubriter emissa credamus effectui quandoque mancipanda, ita ut aut fleetant aut frangant, fleetant consentaneos ad obedientiam, frangant adversarios ad penam.

I. DE VERBO DEI VICTORIOSO

*Sie omne verbum quod natum et egressum est a Deo vincit mundum. Et hec est victoria que vincit mundum, fides nostra,*⁸ qua credimus non esse impossible apud Deum omne verbum de ipso natum et eis enarrantibus mundo annuntiatum. *Nonne in omnem terram exivit sonus memoratorum sedis apostolice mandatorum?* *Nonne celi erant ipsi enarrantes gloriam Dei ac decorum domus Dei?*⁹ Sed sunt quidam qui non credunt possibilia que ipsi annuntiaverunt observanda, quos non tam pusille seu modice quam vel minime vel nullius fidei arguendos estimo, utpote non credentes neque Deo neque ipsis archangelo qui cum virginis conceptum praenunciasset simulque conceptum sterilis iam praeteritum annunciasse¹⁰ conseqenter de ceteris (4) a se praenunciatis adiunxit quia *non erit impossibile apud Deum omne verbum.*¹¹ Ergo iuxta verbum ipsius Christus *regnabit in domo Iacob in eternum et regni eius non erit finis.*¹² Domus vero Iacob recte intelligitur sancta ecclesia beato Petro velut alteri Iacob credita. Quippe ut in veteri testamento cum sint aliquibus personis nomina vel posita ut Ysaae,¹³ vel aucta ut Abrahe,¹⁴ vel minuta ut Sare,¹⁵ nulli omnino inter omnes illius temporis electos nomen legitur omnino mutatum, excepto solo Iacob, cui dictum est: *Non vocaberis ultra Iacob, sed Israel erit nomen tuum.*¹⁶ Sic et in novo testamento soli Petro nomen est mutatum, dicente ad eum Domino: *Simon Bariona, tu vocaberis Cephas quod interpretatur Petrus.*¹⁷

II. DE NOMINE PETRI

Et qua ratione haut incongrue successoribus eius nova nomina ponuntur, cum in sedem ipsius intronizantur.¹⁸ Ille in fortitudine luctaminis directus ad angelum¹⁹ tales obtinuit benedictionem, ut ei diceretur quum *si contra Deum fortis fuisti quanto magis contra homines praevarcabis?* Iste in fortitudine fidei roboratus audavit sibi a Domino dici: *Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram edificabo ecclesiam meam et porte inferi non praralebunt adversus eam.*²⁰ Ille Rachelem propter eius pulchritudine (5) plus amavit, sed Liam²¹ noctu suppositam propter

¹ Luke 7:19. This letter of Gerhoh is not known to exist; cf. Gerhoh's Letters, MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. CXCIII, col. 489. "Ad A. magistrum: Nunc autem successori eius, Adriano Papae, cum sim facie ignotus et iam secundo ei scripta meae parvitas fuerit porrecta, primo per dominum Babenbergensem," etc.

² Deut. 31:7; Josh. 1:6.

³ Innocent II., 1130-43; Eugene III., 1145-53, both of whom legislated against certain abuses in the church.

⁴ *Libelli*, custodia.

⁵ *Libelli*, quicumque.

⁶ Isa. 55:2.

⁷ Luke 12:28.

⁸ I John 5:4.

⁹ Ps. 48:1 (Vulgate enumeration).

¹⁰ Luke 1:26 ff.

¹¹ Luke 1:37.

¹² Gen. 17:19.

¹³ Gen. 17:5.

¹⁴ Gen. 17:13.

¹⁵ Gen. 32:28.

¹⁶ John 1:42.

¹⁷ On his election Octavian assumed the name of John XII. (955-63), an example which has been followed by all successive popes.

¹⁸ Gen. 32:24 ff.

¹⁹ Matt. 16:18.

²⁰ Gen. 29:35.

ipsius fecunditatem patienter toleravit. Iste, in monte transfigurato Domino, quasi conspecta Rachelis pulchritudine, voluerat semper illie manere, dicens: *Domine, bonum est nos hie esse.*¹ Coactus tamen est ad inferiora descendens quasi Lyam tolerare visionemque Rachelis in monte sibi demonstratum nemini dicere nisi peracta Dominica resurrectione. Ille propter lasciviam filiam stupro depravatam et indisciplinatos filios inordinatos, eiusdem stupri ultores turbatus et a mansione sibi dilecta, Sichem, fugatus est,² quos etiam vasa iniquitatis nominat. Iste propter populum Romanum avaricie spiritu constupratum et filios quosdam Symeonis ac Levi vasis iniquitatis bellantibus assimilatos coactus est nonnunquam et cogitur adhuc in suis successoribus fugere ab urbe Roma,³ derelicta interdum sede sibi delectissima. Propter quod sicut ille in benedictione XII filiorum suorum de Symeon et Levi dixit: *Maledictus furor eorum, quia pertinax, et indignatio eorum, quia dura,*⁴ depromens videlicet maledictionem pro benedictione; sic et Petrus Symonem magum sua maledictione in urbe Roma deiecit⁵ et quivis⁶ Petri successor, quemvis⁷ eiusdem Symonis (6) magi successorem iusto zelo habet maledicere atque a benedictione bonorum filiorum seclusus avaricie atque symonie odientium secertere. Atque utinam tu, Adriane, successor Petri apostoli, zelo debito accendaris contra successores Symonis magi negotiantes in domo Domini. Certe, ut de illis taceam quorum plaga circumligata neque videri neque curari potest ab hominibus, quosque sibimet iudicandos reservat index altissimus in ecclesiis matricibus, *culnus et tiror et plaga tumens* abscondi non potest utpote neque *circumligala neque fota oleo,*⁸ ubi absque velamine, sine pietatis tam virtute, que oleum est, quam specie, que velamen est, conductores ecclesias pleiales et praebendas habentes cum suis conducticiis ita manifeste negotiantur, altaria Dei vertentes *iu mensas nummulariorum,*⁹ ut *eorum peccata manifesta sint precedentia ad iudicium.*¹⁰ Huc accedit, quod in solitudinem redactis eorum dormitorii *in cubilibus et impudiciciis*¹¹ ita vivunt, ut nec viduas Deo devotas apostolus concedat sic vivere, contestans quod *vidua in deliciis vivens mortua est.*¹² At isti non solum in delicias verum et in luxuriam transferunt¹³ gratiam Domini nostri (7) Jesu Christi. Quid ad hec facere credendus est rex ille qui, attestante angelo, *regnabit in domo Iacob in eternum et regni eius non erit finis?*¹⁴ Profecto non aliud faciet in veritatis completione, quam praeordinatum est in ipsis veritatis praefiguratione.

III. DE RUBEN PRIMOGENITO LY_E

Denique sicut Ruben cum esset *prior in donis, maior imperio,*¹⁵ utpote primogenitus Iacob de Lia, cui sacerdotalis et imperialis honor debebatur, tamen quia *effusus est, sicut aqua*, dum per incontinentiam *ascendit cubile patris sui et macularit stratum eius dormiendo*, scilicet cum Balam,¹⁶ concubina patris sui patriarche Iacob, pro benedictione meruit maledictionem, ita et isti suo arbitratu benedicti eoram Domino maledicti sunt. Dixit enim pater Iacob: *Ruben, primogenitus meus, fortitudo mea, principium doloris mei, prior in donis, maior imperio effusus es sicut aqua: non crescas, quia ascendisti cubile patris tui et maculasti stratum eius.*¹⁵ Quod dicit "tu fortitudo mea, prior in donis, maior imperio," gravissima est yronia et improperatio de amisso dignitatis tante titulo, qui ei tanquam (8) primogenito debebatur si non ascendisset cubile patris sui et maculasset stratum eius. Propterea sicut pro benedictione reputatur, quod bonis filiis Noe dictum est: *Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram, sitque terror vester super cuncta animantia et bestias terre,*¹⁷ sic pro maledictione reputatur, quod ad

¹ Matt. 17:1 ff.

² Gen., chap. 31.

⁶ *Libelli*, quisquis.

⁷ *Libelli*, quevis.

³ A reference to the struggle between Adrian IV. and the commune of Rome. The papal court, expelled from Rome, was at that time at Benevento.

⁸ Isa. 1:6.

⁹ Matt. 21:12.

⁴ Gen. 49:11.

¹⁰ 1 Tim. 5:24.

¹¹ Rom. 13:13.

⁵ A tradition, preserved in the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, says that Simon Magus, Acts VIII, 9 ff., followed Peter to Rome and there entered into a contest with him, in which Peter was completely victorious.

¹² 1 Tim. 5:4 ff.

¹³ *Libelli*, transfertur.

⁶ Luke 1:33.

¹⁵ Cf. Gen. 35:22, 49:3 ff.

⁷ Gen. 35:22.

¹⁷ Gen. 9:1 ff.

Ruben dixit Iacob: *Non eres eus; cui simile est quod Moyses dixit: Vivat Ruben sitque parrus in numero.*¹ O utinam et nunc in domo Iacob simile iudicium procedat contra istos Rubenitas qui ascenderunt cubile Dei patris et maculaverunt stratum eius! Ascenderunt, inquam, per ambitionem et maculaverunt per pravam conversationem. Ascenderunt aliunde, non per ostium intrantes in orile orium² et maculaverunt ipsum ovile turpiter vivendo, perverse docendo, seu quod nequius est, ipsas oves perdendo et mactando; perdendo sibi consentientes, mactando et persequendo contradicentes. Tales fere per totam Germaniam et Galliam sunt kathedrales clerici et eorum conducticii. Quibus iam frequenter in domo Iacob dictum est, ut non crescerent, ne videlicet quisquam eorum in una ministrans ecclesia se superextendat ad ministrandum (9) in alia, sed sit quisque contentus vel una praebenda vel una plebali ecclesia, cum unaquaque ecclesia, cui facultas suppetit, suum debeat habere sacerdotem similiterque unaquaque congregatio debeat esse contenta uno cenobio, ne in pluribus cenobiis vel certe, ut verius dicamus, in pluribus synagogis unus clericus abutatur multis praebendis. Item in concilio papae Innocentii, praecipiente ipso cum assensu episcoporum et aliorum patrum assidentium, prohibiti sunt crescere, dum sub anathemate interdictum est, *ne canonici de sede episcopali ab electione episcoporum excludant religiosos viros per episcopatum constitutos, sed eorum consilio honesta et ydonea persona in episcopum eligatur. Quod si exclusis eisdem religiosis electio fuerit celebrata, quod absque corum assensu et conuentu factum fuerit, irritum habeatur et vacuum.*³ Sic in synodo Lateranensi tanquam in domo Iacob dictum est, ut hi tales non erescant. Sed ipsi tamen crescunt et multiplicari non desinunt, nisi adhuc fortius dicatur id⁴ ipsum scilicet, ut non crescant. Quomodo, ait quis, hoc fortius dici potest, quam dictum est? Synodalibus edictis et decretalibus mandatis quid fortius (10) dicendum est? Hoc profecto, quod ante suggesti⁵ beate memorie papae Eugenio quodque in libello "De Consideratione" suggestum est eidem per sancte recordationis virum abbatem Clarevallensem,⁶ ut videlicet, perquisitis neglectoribus episcopis, *malos perdat et vineam suam locet alii agriculti qui reddant fructum temporibus suis*, mandata⁸ sedis apostolice servando et tam cenobia quam plebales ecclesiastis rationabiliter ordinando. Amplius adhuc fortius dicendum est, ut Rubenite isti⁹ non crescant. Quia enim semel et simul auferri non possunt isti occupatores terre sancte, qui in terra sanctorum inique agunt,¹⁰ ac propterea non videbunt gloriam Domini, firmiter indicendum est episcopis, ne aliquibus eorum decedentibus eorum consimiles in eorum loca subrogentur, sed ab eis liberata stipendia in usus Deo regulariter servientium et aliorum Christi pauperum dispensantur, sicut martyr et papa Urbanus in suis decretis mandat dicens: "Ipse res singularum parrochiarum in ditione episcoporum, qui locum tenent apostolorum, erant et sunt adhuc et futuris semper debent esse temporibus, ex quibus episcopi et fideles eorum dispensatores omnibus communem vitam degere volentibus (11) ministrare cuncta necessaria debent, prout melius potuerint, ut nemo in eis egens inveniatur."¹¹ Ecce audivimus consolationem dispositam per apostolos et apostolicos viros omnibus communem vitam eligentibus. Videmus autem e contrario magnam desolationem, cum stipendia spiritualis militie ac regularis vite in seculares vanitates translate illis abundant, qui exinde huic seculo militant atque illi egentes angustiati et afflicti sunt, quibus dignus non est mundus. Adhuc autem si adtendis,

¹ Deut. 33:6.

² John 10:1.

³ Cf. The Lateran Council, anno 1139 (not 1135), can. 28; MANSI, Vol. XXI, col. 533; HEFELE, Concilievgeschichte, Vol. V, 2d ed., p. 442. It was held by Innocent II, 1130-43.

⁴ Libelli, ad.

⁵ GERHON'S "Commentary on the LXIVth Psalm" is also called *De Corrupto Ecclesiastico Statu*. Gerhoh composed it shortly after the Council of Rheims, 1148, and, when he was at Rome, 1151, probably presented it in person to Eugene III.

⁶ ST. BERNARD of Clairvaux, *De Consideratione libri quinque ad Eugenium III*. Begun in 1149, it was composed

at intervals and sent to Eugene III. For the text of it, see MIGNE, Pat. Lat., Vol. CLXXXII, cols. 727-808. For the frequent use Gerhoh made of the writings of St. Bernard, see HÜFFER, *Der heilige Bernard von Clairvaux*, Vol. I, p. 202. An uncritical work, but containing some just observations.

⁷ Luke 20:9-16, and Ps. 1:3.

⁸ Ms., mandatis.

⁹ Libelli, iste.

¹⁰ Prov. 2:22.

¹¹ Urban I., 222-30; cf. HINSCHIUS, *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Anglramni*, p. 141; MANSI, Vol. I, col. 749; MIGNE, Pat. Graeca, Vol. X, col. 137.

abominationes maiores videbis. Nam cum sit magna desolatio, qua exposuimus auferri stipendia debita Deo militantibus in communis vita et ad hos transferri qui exinde militant huic seculo, illud procul dubio *abominatione desolationis* est,¹ quod monachi et regulares canonici de agris aut vineis aut nutrimentis animalium suo sumptu elaboratis coguntur solvere decimas aut militibus aut secularibus clericis contra canones antiquos et novos. Nam de antiquis est illud Urbani, quod premisimus, cui multa similia invenire potest lector studiosus. De novis autem illa sunt que in conciliis Innocentii² (12) et Eugenii³ super hoc habemus atque, ut *in ore⁴ non solum duorum*,⁵ sed et trium testium stet hoc iusticie verbum, tuo quoque, Adriane papa, statuto indigemus, quia, defuncto papa Eugenio, putatur a stultis mandatum eius pariter cum illo defunctum de decimis regularium canonorum et monachorum non persolvendis, ubi manibus et sumptibus propriis elaborant suas terras. Nam de colonis eorum nulla est contradicatio, quin illi de suis fructibus atque fetibus illuc persolvere suas decimas debeant, ubi suos infantes baptizant, *metentibus iltis eorum carnalia qui eis persolvunt spiritualia*.⁶ Spirituales autem viri, monachi et regulares canonici, qui a plebanis presbyteris nulla requirunt spiritualia, nimis iniuriouse coguntur eis persolvere carnalia. O mira desolatio et detestabilis abominatione desolationis, cum illi, quibus de decimis populi esset impendenda consolatio, angariantur secularibus personis de suis laboribus decimas dare, quas potius, episcopo dispensante, ipsi ab eis ad sui consolationem deberent accipere. Latuit hactenus ista desolationis abominatione quasi *vulpecula foreas habens*,⁷ dum veluti sub pallio iusticie pharisaiceque *mentam et rutam et omne holus*⁸ (13) *addecimans*, graviora legis, iusticiam, scilicet, ac⁹ misericordiam et fidem preterire solet, sic districte ab omnibus exigebantur decime, ut nec spirituales exciperentur persone, cum nec reges gentium exigant tributum a filiis, sed ab alienis. Neque adtenderunt vel¹⁰ adtendere voluerunt episcopi praemissam doctrinam papae ac martyris Urbani, seu etiam pape Gregorii¹¹ scribentis ad Augustinum Anglorum episcopum, ut communi vita viventibus de faciendis portionibus nichil imponatur ubi omne, quod superest, piis et religiosis causis in usus pauperum est erogandum, iuxta illud evangelicum: *Quod superest date et omnia munda crunt vobis*.¹² Latuit, inquam, hec *vulpecula demoliens vineas*.¹³ At nunc exagitata quasi latratibus canum dominicorum, videlicet, pontificum Romanorum Innocentii et Eugenii doctrinis apostolicis, eisdem iam defunctis, putat sibi liberum non iam dente vulpino, sed aprino, evidenter vastare vineas Domini Sabaoth. Sentiat ergo adhuc in te, pater Adriane, spiritum antecessorum tuorum vivere; sentiat, inquam, se acerius exigitandam bestia hec nequissima, que devoravit Ioseph,¹⁴ nisi casset a cepta¹⁵ malicia.

IV. DE IOSEPH PRIMOGENITO RACHELIS

Quia enim, ut supra diximus, dictum est ei sub nomine (14) Ruben ut non crescat in domo Iacob, nimis emulatur Ioseph filium acrecentem, cui dixit pater Iacob: *Filius accrescens Ioseph, filius accrescens, et decorus aspectu: filie discurrerunt super murum. Sed exasperaverunt eum, et iurgati sunt, invideruntque illi habentes iacula. Sedet iu fori arcus eius et dissoluta sunt vincula brachiorum et manuum illius per manus potentis Iacob. Inde pastor egressus est lapis Israel. Deus patris tui erit adiutor tuus, et Omnipotens benedic tibi benedictionibus celi desuper, benedictionibus abyssi iacentis deorsum, benedictionibus uberum et vulve. Benedictiones patris tui confortate sunt benedictionibus patrum eius, donec veniret*

¹ Matt., 24:15; Dan. 9:27; 12:2.

² *Libelli*, et.

¹⁰ *Libelli*, neque.

² Lateran Council, 1139, can. 10; MANSI, Vol. XXI, col. 528; HEFELE, Vol. V, 2d ed., p. 441.

¹¹ Gregory I, 590-604, in his letter to Augustine, whom he had sent as a missionary (596) to the Anglo-Saxons; MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. LXXVII, col. 1184; Bk. XI, no. 64; *Responsio prima*. See also M. G. II, *Gregorii I. Papae Registrum Epistolarum*, Vol. II, p. 333, where it is numbered Bk. XI, 56a.

³ *Libelli*, in more.

¹² Luke 11:41.

¹³ Song of Sol. 2:15.

⁴ Matt. 18:16.

¹⁴ Gen. 37:33.

¹⁵ *Libelli*, accepta.

⁵ Matt. 8:20.

⁶ 1 Cor. 9:11.

⁷ Luke 11:42.

*desiderium collum eternorum: fiant in capite Joseph et in vertice Nazarei inter fratres suos.*¹ Et quidem altiore sacramento hec benedictiones Ioseph a sanctis patribus exponuntur de ipso Christo patris altissimi primogenito. At tamen quoniam sicut scriptum est, *Inde pastor egressus est*, cui dixit verus ac summus Ioseph, *Si diligis me pasce oves meas,*² non incongrue de quovis pastore Christum diligente ac proinde sincero amoris affectu ipsius oves pascente omnia hec poterunt intelligi. Quia non solum senatus apostolorum princeps orbis terrarum principatum Ioseph (15) in tota terra Egypti dominantis representat, sed et omnis cetus virorum sanctorum, qui non ut Ruben de Lya sed sicut Ioseph de Rachele se natum contestatur, primo assimilatus ei per custodiam castitatis, cui multum cooperatur claustralibus inclusio, sicut ille maluit pati careerem quam ad placitum domine sue contra dominum suum violare fidem,³ in quo conprobatus est amor domini sui, deinde per curam pastoralem secundum quod ille dixit fratribus suis, *Ego pascam vos et parvulos vestros.*⁴ Cui simile est quod primo examinatus est amor Petri erga Dominum et postea commissa est ei cura ovium, dicente Christo, *Amas me?* ac subiungente, *Pasce oves meas sive agnos meos.* Sic praeparatus est beatus Petrus velut alter Ioseph ad pascendos multos populos et etiam snos fratres, de quibus ei dictum est: *Confirmata fratres tuos.*⁵ Alioquin fame nimia imminente periret Egyptus, id est, totus mundus et infirmitate deficerent ipsi quoque fratres eius, episcopi, videlicet, partim officio et merito, partim solo nomine fratres. Neque vero soli beato Petro sed et cuilibet successori eius dictum illud Christi congruit: *Pasce oves meas et confirmata fratres tuos.*⁶ Unde ad te quoque, Adriane papa, illud pertinere non dubium est, quoniam tu, sine dubio, regularem vitam servando etiam ante papatum⁷ praeventus es in benedictionibus dulcedinis a Ruben, filio Lye, (16) omnino alienis et super caput Ioseph sicut auditum est copiose thesaurizantis dicente patre Iacob: *Fiant in capite Joseph et in vertice Nazarei inter fratres suos.* Considera, queso, nunc totum Ioseph, totum, videlicet, chorum spiritualium virorum de Rachele genitorum quos pater altissimus amat plurimum et ideo fratres eius oderunt illum nec possunt ei quicquam pacifice loqui. Hoc et in benedictione Ioseph notatum est ubi dictum est: *Exasperaverunt eum invaderuntque illi habentes iacula.* Et tu, quidem, Romane pontifex, post Christum *caput Joseph et vertex Nazarei* tamquam in alto positus non tangeris illorum sagittis, at ego miser et mei similes in imo positi, grandi experimento edocti, non indigemus nobis exponi quam vere dictum sit de uno filio Rachelis quod eventurum erat plurimis eiusdem filiis. *Exasperaverunt*, inquit, *eum et iurgati sunt, invideruntque illi habentes iacula.* O quoties isti exasperaverunt me habentes iacula, quibus fuisse graviter fossus, nisi quod sedes apostolica facta est mihi refugium a venenatis iaculis eorum! Unde et memor fatigationis mee praeterite represento tibi, patri, textum epistole quam inter huiuscmodi sagittarios misi beate memoriae papae Innocentio, cuius textus ita se habet.⁸

Innocentio divina favente clementia sedis apostolice (17) antistiti frater G[erhohus] sue sanctitatis qualiscumque servus devotas orationes cum obedientia. Domine, refugium tu factus es nobis in Domino, qui, priusquam fierent montes aut formarentur terra et orbis,⁹ te praedestinavit nobis pium patronum contra violentias impiorum. Puto enim, si non esset nobis apostolice sedis asilum iam redacti essemus ad nichil per iniquas potentias impiorum. Sed tu, beate vir, qui non soles abire in consilio impiorum, nec sedes in cathedra pestilentie,¹⁰ sed in cathedra potestatis apostolice per tue pietatis eximum effectum, factus es nobis refugium, immo eterna Christi pietas, que regnat in corde tuo, facta est nobis turris fortitudinis a facie impiorum,¹¹ qui nos afflixerunt et affligunt. Petro Leonis tyrannizante¹² multa passi sumus ab eius fautoribus,¹³ quando vidimus impium superexaltatum et

¹ Gen. 49:22-26.

² John 21:15 ff.

⁹ Ps. 89:1 f.

³ Gen. 39:7 ff.

⁴ Gen. 45:7 and 10.

¹⁰ Ps. 1:1

⁵ Luke 22:32.

⁶ John 21:17, Luke 22:32.

¹¹ Ps. 60:4.

⁷ Adrian IV., before his elevation to the cardinalate, had been a member of the house of regular canons, known as St. Rufus, near Avignon.

⁸ This letter is quoted by Gerhoh also in his letters, No. 21, MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. CXCIII, col. 548.

¹² Petrus Leonis, better known as the anti-pope, Anaclet II., 1130-1139, who contested the election of Innocent II.

¹³ Gerhoh here refers to the opposition he encountered when he declared that schismatics could not efficaciously perform the sacraments.

elevatum sicut cedros Lybani. Sed transivi et ecce non erat.¹ Hereses autem sunt, quia eas oportet esse apostolo asserente:² Inter has laboravimus et adhuc laboramus.³ Nam pro eo quod aliquando scriptis ac dictis confutavimus hereticum sensum quorundam asserentium Christi corpus extra ecclesiam etiam ab excommunicatis confici, nisi tu, pater, mihi tunc fuisses in refugium, heretici me dampnassent quasi hereticum. Sed quia residuum bruci paratus est comedere locusta,⁴ succedunt malis mala. Nam de fumo putei abyssi, ut Iohannes in Apocalypsi⁵ previdit, nunc exierunt locuste, videlicet plures discipuli Petri Abailardi,⁶ affirmantes hominem de virgine sumptum non esse Deum, sed ipsius Dei singulare habitaculum in (18) quo cum habitet omnis plenitudo divinitatis corporaliter;⁷ non tamen dicunt ei convenire nomen Deitatis, aut Deus dicatur nisi figurativa locutione, qua continens pro contento, vel pro contento continens, nominamus. Est enim figurativa locutio, si habens pro habito nominatur, quod plerumque solet fieri, uti manu factum templum vocamus ecclesiam propterea quod habet vel continet ecclesiam, id est, iustos in ea convocatos, et in evangelio, ubi dicitur: *Creditit ipse et domus eius tota*,⁸ familie datur nomen domus, quia familiam habet vel continet domus. Ita, inquit, figurativa est locutio, quando vel homini Deum in se habenti assignamus nomen Dei, vel Deum in homine manentem dicimus hominem. Nos autem, quia Deum proprie hominem et hominem Deum predicamus, ne forte in vacuum curramus,⁹ tibi pater, per latorem¹⁰ presentium super questione hae misimus tractatum, quem si tua approbat auctoritas, iterum cantabo quod et antea cantavi: Domine, refugium tu factus es nobis, non quod confido¹¹ in te, mortali homine, sed in Petro, immo in petra, cuius fortitudini porte inferi non prevalebunt. Item postea inter similia perieula a papa Celestino suscepimus scriptum consolatorium et confortatorium, cuius hoc est rescriptum; Celestinus¹² episcopus servus servorum Dei dilecto filio G[erhoho] Richerisbergensi praeposito salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Super tribulationibus et angustiis quas pro veritatis et iustitiae assertione dilecti filii nostri G¹³ diaconi cardinalis attestatione te sustinere accepimus, paterna tibi affectione compati-mur et in quibus secundum (19) Deum possumus opem tibi et consilium libenter impendimus. In quibus tanto maiorem pacientiam te oportet habere quanto certius est tnam industriam easdem persecutiones pro defensione iusticie sustinere. Scis enim nec novum esse nec insolitum quod iuxta apostolum qui pie volunt vivere in Christo persecutionem patiuntur¹⁴ ab impiis et dissimilibus, quos Dominus in evangelio consolatur beatitudinem eternam illis repromittens. Beati, inquit, qui persecutionem patiuntur propter iusticiam.¹⁵ Nos tamen pro debito officii nostri emulis tuis obviare et censura ecclesiastica eos cohibere volumus. Unde per presentia tibi scripta mandamus quatenus proxima domenica qua legitur: "Ego sum pastor bonus"¹⁶ nostro te conspectui representes ut per te ipsum causa plenius cognita quieti et tranquillitatibus tue providere et sicut dilecto filio oportune tibi subvenire valeamus.—Datum Lat. VI, Kal. Feb.¹⁷

Novissime quoque innumeris expositus iaculis ad papam Eugenium confugi cuius et verbis et scriptis confortatus didici quam vere dictum sit in benedictionibus Ioseph: *Sedet in forti areus eius et dissoluta sunt vineula brachiorum et manuum eius per manum potentis Iacob.*¹⁸ Et ut¹⁹ noveris tu, Adriane papa, quam clementer ille me respexit, considera ipsius epistolam qua dissoluta sunt vineula brachiorum et manuum mearum per manum potentis Iacob. Textus eius hic est: *Eugenius²⁰ episcopus servus servorum Dei dilecto filio G[erhoho] Richerisbergensi preposito salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.* Scripta devotionis tue benigne receperimus et

¹ Ps. 37:35 f.

² Cor. 11:19.

Damian, who had recently returned from an embassy to Bohemia. Gerhoh had accompanied him as far as Prague. He had been absent from Rome on this embassy from September 1142 to February 1144.

³ Cf. 1 Cor. 15:10, 2 Cor. 6:5, and 12:23, 27.

⁴ Rev. 9:1 ff.

¹⁴ 2 Tim. 3:12.

¹⁵ Matt. 5:10.

⁴ Joel 1:4.

⁵ Rev. 9:1 ff.

¹⁶ That is, the second Sunday after Easter. John 10:11. Gerhoh's account of his journey to Rome is found in MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. CXCIII, col. 1106.

⁶ Petrus Palatinus, known as Abelard, 1079-1142.

⁶ John 1:53.

¹⁷ That is, at the Lateran Palace, January 27, 1144.

⁷ Col. 2:9.

⁷ John 1:53.

¹⁸ Libelli, tn.

⁹ Phil. 2:16, Gal. 2:2.

¹⁹ Gen. 49:24.

²⁰ Cf. J. L., No. 8922. Given at Sutri, May 16, 1146. Gerhoh quotes it also in his Commentary on Ps. 38. MIGNE, Vol. CXCIII, col. 1378; *Libelli*, Vol. III, pp. 422f.; also in Gerhoh's Letters, Nos. 17 and 21, MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. CXCIII, cols. 567, 577.

¹¹ MS. Confida.

¹² Celestine II, 1143-4. For this letter, Cf. Jaffé-Löwenfeld, No. 8181, MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. CXCIII, col. 578. Gerhoh quotes it also, in part, in his commentary on the 46th Psalm.

¹³ Probably Guido, card. deacon of SS. Cosmas and

*ferorem tue religionis ex eorum inspecione manife ste cognorimus. Concauit enim cor tuum
intra te et in meditatione tua exardescit ignis.¹ (20) Ignitum quoque eloquium tuum vehementer.
Super hoe itaque, quod contra pessimas novilates, commotiones quoque, que contra ecclesiam
Dei et personas ecclesiasticas oriuntur, te zelo karitatis exardescere cognoscimus, paterno
affectu gaudemus et devotionem tuam collaudamus. Verum quoniam bonum est incipere sed
nullo melius consummare, dilectionem tuam in Domino commonemus ut in bono proposito
perseveres quia nos personam tuam tamquam litteratum et religiosum virum paterna karitate
diligimus et in quibus secundum Deum possumus honorare et manu tenere columus.—Datum
Sutri XVII. Kal. Iunii.*

Audis, presul Romane Adriane, quomodo antecessores tui astiterunt mihi agonizanti et pugnanti ad bestias,² que sepe expugnaverunt me a iuventute mea, iam fere per annos XXX. prolongata iniquitate illorum *fabricantium supra dorsum meum*:³ et nequum peracta est pugna. Etenim non potuerunt mihi sie prevalere, quin vineula brachiorum et manuum mearum semper essent soluta, ut adhuc gratia Dei sunt per manum potentis Iacob, protegente me pariter et divina gratia et apostolice sedis tutela fortissima contra Symonem⁴ in domo Dei negotiantem, contra Nycolaum⁵ impurum, contra Neronis tyrannidem⁶ adhuc in laicis quibusdam sevientem et Symoni mago contra Symonem Petrum nequiter faventem. His itaque quasi tribus amicis confutatis, Helyu⁷ turbulentus contra me insurgit,⁸ irruens ex adverso, quasi turbo ad dispergendum me, sic involvendo sententias sermonibus, prout ipsi videtur, exquisitis, sed prout ego arbitror, (21) imperitis, ut, nisi Dominus de turbine illi⁹ pro me respondere dignetur, tota salus mea, immo totius ecclesie periclitetur graviter, quoniam non ut cumque flumen illiditur domui Dei fundate supra petram, sed ipsam, quod auditu horrendum est, nititur subfodere aut findere petram. Que, licet habeat foramina, in quibus nidificat columba, utpote clavis et lancea per milites cavata, non confringi vel scindi potuit aut poterit, sicut scriptum est: *Os non comminuetis ex eo quia nec tunica eius inconsutilis scissa fail, sed integra permansit.*¹⁰ Petra enim est Christus, petra indivisa, petra solida, nullius unquam susceptibilis divisionis, totus in paterna, totus in materna substantia, totus in ecclesia regnante in celis, totus in ecclesia perigrinante ac militante super terram, sursum invitans ad gloriam, deorsum confortans ad patientiam. Sic denique implet proprietatem sui nominis, quod est Emanuel,¹¹ ut, sicut in divinitate sua unus est cum patre Deus, ita quoque in humanitate sua sit etiam nobiscum Deus. In humanitate, inquam, sua non solum in sue persone unitatem sed in sue divinitatis unionem suscepta. Et de personali quidem unitate catholicus doctor Athanasius congruenter assignavit hanc similitudinem ut diceret sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo ita Deus et homo unus est Christus. Sed de naturarum ineffabili unione in creaturis plenam similitudinem non invenit. Que denique creatura sic transit in alteram sibi oppositam ut permaneat quod erat incipiens esse quod non erat? Et quidem conatus est beatus Papa Gregorius (22) in Ezechiele¹² tale quid ostendere, affirmans quod sicut aqua transit in christallum, permanente, videlicet, naturali essentia cum quantitate sua sed sola qualitate mutata, sic humana Christi natura, in similitudinem aque, primo fragilis, per resurrectionem firmata, veluti christalli soliditatem accepit. Verum ista similitudo longe minus habet ab assimilato. Transiens enim aqua in christallum non retinet in se totum quod habet essentialia, quia, cum essentialiter et non accidentaliter aqua sit humida, in christallum transiens et secca effecta, desinit esse quod substantialiter erat. Non sic in Christo, non sic humanitas transiens in divinitatis gloriam desinet esse quod substantialiter erat, sed provecta est ultra quam erat. Ita ut, licet suscipiens divinitas non sit suscepta humanitas, vel e converso, quia indestructibilis est utriusque nature permansio, tamen quam vere corpus, accepta humanitate, permanens quod erat, sit quod non erat, id est, homo, et vere,

¹ Ps. 38:4.² 1 Cor. 15:32.³ Ps. 123:3.⁷ Job 32:1ff.⁸ *Libelli*, consurgit.⁴ Cf. Acts 8:9.⁵ Cf. Rev. 2:6, 15.⁹ Job 38:1.¹⁰ Cf. John 19:23.⁶ Probably refers to the attitude of the nobility toward bishops and abbots who exercised temporal authority.¹¹ Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:23.¹² Ezek. 1:22; cf. Eccles. 43:22.

accepta leonitate, sit leo, et similiter in substantiis aliis animalis corpori accedentibus et speciem constituentibus, idem invenis, ita nimirum, mediante anima, data et unita hominis corpori divinitas, in eo nomine *quod est super omne nomen*¹ contulit illi esse quod non erat, scilicet, Deus, manente tam divinitate quam humanitate quod erat, et, incipiente Deo esse quod non erat, subaudis homo, sicut et homo accepit esse quod non erat, scilicet, Deus. *Et hoc est mirabile in oculis nostris, primus novissimus et novissimus sit primus*² sicut ipse ait: *Ego sum et ω, primus et novissimus.*³ Quis magis (23) immo quid aliud est primum quam omnium principium? *Ego, inquit, principium qui et loquor vobis;*⁴ quod ait *ego principium* refer ad *primum*; quod vero ait *qui et loquor vobis* refer ad *novissimum*. Denique cum omnia visibilia creasset Deus, novissime, in sexta die, creavit hominem, cui soli inter omnia visibilia dedit rationandi et loquendi facultatem. Deus igitur homo factus, a primo usque ad novissimum inclinatus, absque sue divinitatis defectu sed cum immenso nostre humanitatis profectu. Quo enim altius proficere haberet natura humana quam ut, aquatica fluxe mutabilitatis infirmitate deposita, in divine inmutabilitatis christallinam soliditatem commutata esset super omnia *nomen habens quod super omne nomen est.*⁵ Unde et in visione prophetica dicitur: *Et similitudo super capita animalium firmamentum quasi aspectus christalli horribilis et extenti super capita eorum desuper. Et super firmamentum quod erat imminens capiti eorum quasi aspectus lapidis saphyri similitudo throni, et super similitudinem throni similitudo quasi aspectus hominis desuper. Et vidi quasi speciem electri retut aspectum ignis intrinsecus per circuitum a lumbis eius desuper et a lumbis eius usque deorsum* (24) *vidi quasi speciem ignis splendidis in circuitu velut aspectum arcus cum fucrit in nube in die pluvie. Hic erat aspectus splendoris per gyrum. Hec visio similitudinis glorie Domini. Mira visionum dissimilitudo.*⁶ Propheta vidit humanam in Christo naturam *quasi aspectum christalli*, videlicet commutatam a sua mutabilitate in soliditatem non angelicam, qualis et sanctis hominibus permittitur, sed omnino divinam. Nostris temporibus dialectici vel potius heretici vident eam vix ad angelorum dignitatem provectam. Ille vidit super *similitudinem throni quasi aspectum hominis desuper et quasi speciem electri*. Isti sub throno Dei cum ceteris electis hominibus collocant hominem assumptum quem negant in excelso throno sedere in paterne glorie coequalitate, vel potius unitate. Speciem quoque clarissimi electri de argento humanitatis et auro divinitatis confecti non aspiciunt, quia duas naturas in Christo ita coadunatas non credunt, sicut in electro aurum et argentum coadunantur, auro aliquatenus pallescente sed argente fulgescente. Nos autem cum propheta videmus aurum palluisse in Christo, cum posteriora dorsi eius in pallore auri quasi exinanita divinitatis plenitudine in passione (25) ipsius disparuerunt. Sed quia Moysi posteriora eius videnda et post hec sive per hec etiam gloria eius ostendenda promittebatur, nos cum ipso Moysi in foramine petre⁷ stantes, ipsum, quem scimus humana passum, credimus in eadem natura, qua passus est, ad divina proiectum, latenter quidem in virginali utero, sicut et David pater eius clam consecratus est in regem, nesciente Saule, in paterna domo.⁸ Sicut autem ille, mortuo Saule, unctus est manifeste⁹ super dominum Iuda, universum Israelem, sic et homo in Deum assumpitus et solus electus ex milibus ad regnandum in domo Jacob in eternum idoneus, devicto mortis principe, manifeste *gloria et honore* divine claritatis *coronatus*, regnum tenet omnium seculorum non minore potentia, sapientia, clementia, disponens et gubernans omnia in humana sua natura quam ea creavit in divina. Hominis quippe filio datum est regnum et honor ab Antiquo dierum, sicut Danieli demonstratum est,¹⁰ cui et iudicium datum est eo et in eo quod filius hominis est. Nam in eo quod filius Dei est numquam non habuit quod patris fuit. Unde et dicit: *Omnia que habet*

¹ Phil. 2:9.⁴ John 8:25.⁵ Phil. 2:9.² Ps. 118:23; Matt. 21:42, 19:30, 20:16; Mark 9:35, 10:31; Luke⁹12:30.⁶ Ezek. 1:22, 26-28.⁷ Exod. 33:20 ff.³ Cf. Isa. 41:4, 44:6; Rev. 1:8, 17, 22:13.⁸ 1 Sam. 16.⁹ 2 Sam. 2.¹⁰ Dan. 7.

*Pater mea sunt.*¹ Propter humanitatem vero dicit: *Omnia mihi tradita sunt a Patre meo.*² Quenam sunt illa omnia que (26) unacum patre suo Christus in divinitate sua semper habuit queque idem in humanitate sua sibi tradita dicit? Profecto illa sunt que pater habuit non solum sub se vel creata vel creanda, sed etiam que habuit et habet in se increata, eterna, et immensa; verbi gratia, potentia, sapientia, iusticia, veritas, bonitas, et cetera huiusmodi que in Deo non sunt multa sed unum; immo que in Deo non sunt aliud quam Deus unus omnino simplex. Esto, inquit, ut homini assumpto data sit verbi potentia, sapientia, bonitas et alia hominis capacitatibus capabilia. Eternitas vero et immensitas nature humanae incapabilis est, nec illa eius capax est quia quod inicium habet eternum fieri non potest, quodque circumscriptum est immensitatem capere non potest. Hec dicendo sapientes huius mundi praesumunt carnes agni aqua coctas manducare, dum sapientia humana, quam stultam fecit Deus, nituntur etiam inscrutabilia scrutari. Nos autem, caput cum pedibus vorare cupientes infirma humanitatis unacum altissimis divinitatis, non solum igne assa manducamus verum etiam igne comburendum relinquimus quod residuum fuerit.³ Verbi gratia, non (27) solum credibile sed etiam intelligibile per gratiam Dei cognoscimus quod homo, in quo sunt omnes thesauri sapientie et scientie Dei, omnia scit sicut ei Petrus dicit: *Domine, tu omnia scis,*⁴ ac proinde in sapientia vel scientia non est inferior vel minor patre suo, Deo eterno, a quo data est ei proprii filii naturalis filiatio. Item qui dicit: *Data est mihi omnis potestas in celo et in terra*⁵ non minus est potens patre suo omnipotente. Comedere seu vorare utecumque possumus talia non solum credibilia sed etiam intelligibilia. Que autem superexcedunt intellectum non hominum tantum sed etiam angelorum ut *pax Dei que exsuperat omnem sensum*,⁶ ut etiam illud profundum iudiciorum Dei, quo *Iacob dilexit Esau autem odio habuit*⁷ antequam quicquam ficerent boni vel mali, seu etiam illud universale profundum, quo eternaliter omnes consimiles Iacob dilexit omnesque consimiles Esau odio habuit. Hec, inquam, et similia omnem intellectum superexcellentia de agni carnibus igni comburimus reservando ea *Spiritu Saneto qui scrutatur omnia etiam profunda Dei.*⁸ De talibus est etiam illud quod, ut Ambrosius ait in Lucam, cui Deus Pater omnia dedit, eternitatem dedit maiestatemque transfundit. De his enim duobus, ut iam prelibavimus, maior est contradicatio asserentibus nobis omnia, que habet Pater, data esse homini assumpto in Deum, Dei filium, sic ut ipse sit Deus, Dei filius, non geminata filii persona, sed unius persone manente natura gemina, et altera per alteram deificata, glorificata, et clarificata claritate, quam natura superior habuit priusquam mundus fieret. Gloria enim omnis non verbo sed earni acquirebatur, ut asserit Hylarius, (28) quia verbo nichil deceaserat quod ei patris munere fuisset reddendum. Unde non verbum sed hominem constat et *paulominus ab angelis minoratum*⁹ et, consummata obedientia *gloria et honore coronatum*, in throno maiestatis paterne, in quo ne inferior aut minor estimetur eterno et immenso patre, non ad sinistram sed ad dextram dicitur sedere,¹⁰ iam non minor, glorificatus, qui minor fuerat quando vidimus eum non habentem *speciem neque decorum.*¹¹ Hinc Hylarius. Glorificatus, inquit, filium pater maior est, glorificatus autem, filius minor non est. Aut quomodo minor est qui in gloria patris est? Dicis itaque mihi: Quomodo ergo verum est quod dicit Athanasius minor patre secundum humanitatem, si secundum Hylarium constiterit quod homo in throno glorie sublimatus et magnificatus non sit inferior aut minor patre? Ad hoc respondeo: Duos istos patres diversa non adversa hoc loco sentire eum alter eorum agat de natura humanitatis, que, sive in gloria, sive in pena, nunquam erit vel maior vel minor se ipsa, in quantum est natura humana que tanta est in minimo infante quanta in grandissimo gigante, tanta in Iuda perduto quanta in Petro salvato; alter vero agat de gloria que natura humana in Christo non solum naturaliter sed supernaturaliter est collata. Naturaliter enim natura humana, cum sit rationalis, per ipsam rationem capax est eterne sapientie, in aliis ad mensuram, in Christo sine mensura. *Non enim ad mensuram dedit Deus spiritum*¹² homini concepto per spiritum.

¹ John 16:15.² Matt. 12:9.³ Exod. 12:9, 10.⁷ Rom. 9:13.⁸ 1 Cor. 2:10.⁹ Ps. 8:6.⁴ John 21:17.⁵ Matt. 28:18.⁶ Phil. 4:7.¹⁰ Heb. 1:3.¹¹ Isa. 53:2.¹² John 3:34.

Sed quomodo sit capax eternitatis et immensitatis homo in tempore creatus et circumscriptus (29) naturalem sensum excedit, quia supra naturam est, fide apprehendendum non sensu vel intellectu comprehendendum. Fide ergo hoc tenemus et fidelibus id ipsum eredendum non discutiendum suademos. Infidelibus autem eum Apostolo dicimus: *O homo, tu quis es qui respondeas Deo?*¹ Tu rationis acumine vis omnia secreta fidei penetrare quod esset fidem evanescere; quoniam, si vides non est fides. *Ego autem credidi, propterea locutus sum.*² Credidi Christo non solum dicenti ante mortem: *Pater maior me est,*³ sed etiam post resurrectionem: *Data est mihi omnis potestas in celo et in terra.*⁴ Credidi Apostolo asserenti quod is, qui modicum quam angelii minoratus est, excelsior celis factus est, tanto melior angelis effectus quanto differentius prae illis nomen hereditavit.⁵ Notandum sane quod non dieit "excelsior existens" sed "factus" et "melior angelis effectus," ut eam naturam intelligas, vel, si non potes intelligere, saltim credas in Christo magnificatam, quam constat factam. Si enim dicas ceteros electos *quos predestinavit illos et magnificavit,*⁶ quomodo is, qui predestinatus est filius Dei in unitate secundum spiritum sanctificationis, non est eredendus magnificatus et nimis exaltatus super omnes celos usque ad orientem? Quo nomine intelligitur divinitas verbi de Patre oriens ortu eterno, neque tam proprie dicitur ortus quam oriens, eo quod fine caret eterna eius nativitas, quae ille splendor glorie paterne oritur de patre emplens nubem candidam, susceptam de matre, omni divinitatis plenitudine atque claritate, quod est eam elevatam esse ad orientem dum clarificatea est claritate quam verbum habuit *priusquam mundus fieret.*⁷ Sicut ipsi oranti ut clarificaretur (30) a Patre suo responsum est: *Et clarificari et iterum clarificabo.*⁸ Quod est dicere: "Clarificavi te in conceptione secundum quod predestinatus es filius meus in virtute secundum spiritum sanctificationis, qui est amor meus, quo in matre operante conceptus es, et iterum clarificabo secundum eundum spiritum sanctificationis et ex resurrectione mortuorum, per quam revelabitur gloria divina tibi, verbo, insita per naturam, sed tibi, homini, data per gratiam." Sic sic magnificatus Rex pacificus super omnes reges universe terre, sic exaltatus est super celos celorum ad orientem. Magnificatus, inquam, est non ad mensuram quia magnitudinis eius (31) non est finis, ac proinde immensitas illi data est non qualem fingit Manicheus,⁹ cui videtur undique in infinitum protensus Deus, in quo errore fuit aliquando etiam beatus Augustinus quemadmodum in libro Confessionum suarum ipse de se scribens fatetur, sed qualem credit Christianus et qualem discipulis suis optat cognoscibilem fieri Paulus apostolus dicens: *Huius rei gratia flecto genua mea* (et cetera usque) *possitis comprehendere cum omnibus sanctis que sit latitudo, longitudo, sublimitas, et profundum.*¹⁰ Noli dimensionibus istis tibi fingere grandissimum simulachrum pro Deo colendum, (32) sed agnoscet latitudinem Dei, karitatem, qua omnia diligit et nichil odit eorum, que fecit, longitudinem vero eiusdem karitatis, eternitatem, quia longius eternitate nichil cogitari potest; sublimitatem, potentiam, profundum, sapientiam, quibus, quattuor nominibus cum tibi describitur Deus, magnus et immensus, non corporali protensione sed spirituali virtute attingens a fine usque ad finem, non habens ipse finem, respice simul et in cruem vel potius in crucifixum, Jesum Christum, et vide an et ibi tibi appareat eadem (33) latitudo, longitudo, sublimitas, et profundum, secundum que, magnum vel potius immensum poteris estimare ipsum crucifixum, cuius etiam secundum hominem latissima karitas non habet finem, cum diligit omnia que diligit et Pater, maxime illos quos Pater in ipso predestinavit ante constitutionem mundi¹¹ ut essent sancti et immaculati. Quia vero nichil antiquius hac praedestinatione, utique sicut nichil latius, ita nec longius est aliquid ista praedestinatorum dilectione. Quid autem profundius Christi etiam secundum hominem sapientia, cui datum est

¹ Rom 9:20.² Ps. 115:10.

⁹ Manichaeus, or Māni, born c. 215, A. D., near Ctesiphon, the founder of one of the most influential and widespread systems of Gnosticism. St. Augustine was for a time an adherent of his system. Cf. *The Confessions of St. Augustine*, Book III, 6, 14, etc.

³ John 14:28.⁴ Matt. 28:18.¹¹ Eph. 1:4.⁵ Ps. 8:6; Heb. 2:7, 7:26, 1:4.⁷ John 17:5.¹⁰ Eph. 3:14-18.⁶ Rom. 8:30.⁸ John 12:28.

nosse omnia; et quid sublimius eius potentia, cui datum est posse omnia quecumque vult, sicut et Pater eius omnia quecumque voluit fecit? Ex his, que dicta sunt, manifestum est homines illos errasse de filio hominis, quorum alii dicebant eum esse Iohannem, alii Helyam, alii Hierenniam aut unum ex prophetis,¹ in quorum errore adhuc isti detinentur qui Christi magnitudinem sic metiuntur ad mensuram assumpte humanitatis, ut eidem humanitati negent inesse virtutem illius immense claritatis quam apud Deum Patrem filius Deus habuit priusquam mundus fieret.² Ex hac nimis recte praedicatur homo assumptus (34) maior Iohanne Baptista, quia cum ille sit exinde magnus quod per Gabrielem angelum preco eius prenuntiatus est concipiendus a sterili, iste per eundem archanghelum praenuntiatus est filius Dei altissimi nominandus et concipiendus a virgine.³ Ille in spiritu et virtute Helye *viam Domino praeparatus*,⁴ iste in spiritu et virtute altissimi exultatur ut *gygas ad currendum viam*⁵ sibi paratam. Ille angelus ante faciem Domini missus,⁶ iste angelus magni consilii consilium⁷ ipsum perficere idoneus. De illo dictum est: *Erit enim magnus coram Domino;*⁸ de isto scriptum est: *Magnus Dominus et laudabilis nimis et magnitudinis eius non est finis.*⁹ Vere utique. Nam licet universa creatura Creatori comparata incomparabiliter inveniatur illo minor, tamen illa nova creatura que in virgine de satis tribus¹⁰ est in unum panem fermentata, coadunatis in unum tribus essentiis, anima, scilicet, rationali, carne humana, divinitate immensa et eterna, in una sui persona, illa, inquam, creatura maior est mundo et licet in sui natura minor, tamen in gloria nominis, *quod est super omne nomen.*¹¹ sibi dati, Patri id ipsum nomen danti equalis, quoniam sicut Patris et filii et Spiritus sancti una est divinitas equalis, (35) gloria indivisa, potestas, ita verbi hominem in se deificantis, hominisque deificati, una est divinitas equalis, gloria indivisa, potestas, ac proinde in Dei filio adoranda est ipsius humanitas eque ut eius divinitas, quia, ut verbis utar magni Leonis,¹² quod in naturis Christi erat et est proprium non est in potestate diversum. Denique in sermone ad populum de Epiphania dicit inter cetera de tribus magis. *Quod cordibus credunt muneribus protestantur, thus Deo, mirram homini, aurum offerunt regi, scientes humanam divinamque naturam in unitate venerandam, quia quod erat in substantiis proprium non erat in potestate diversum.* Quod et sancti patres in Ephesina synodo perpendentes circa finem concilii dixerunt:¹³ *Si quis audet dicere assumptionem hominem a verbo coadorari cum Deo verbo oportere et conglorificari et connuncupari Deum, tamquam alterum alteri adiectione enim unus syllabe, id est, eon, hoc eogit intelligi, et non magis una reverentia veneretur Emmanuel, unamque glorificationem dependerit, secundum quod verbum caro factum est, anathema sit.* Item, Johannes Damascenus in libro *De Dispensatione et Beneficio nostre Salutis*. Unus, ait, est Christus Dominus perfectus et (36) homo perfectus, quem adoramus cum Patre et Spiritu una adoratione, cum *αχοπατον* id est, immaculata carne ipsius, non carnem non adorandum esse dicentes. Adoratur enim in una verbi persona que ipsi persona fuit vel facta fuit non creationem colentes. Non enim sicut nudam carnem adoramus, sed sicut Deitati unitam et sicut in unam prosopon et unam personam verbi duabus ipsius reductis naturis. Sie itaque devitamus primum tangere propter ignem ligno coniunctum. Adoramus Christi utrumque propter Divinitatem carni unitam. Ecce audimus a Basilio Divinitatem carni unitam ac proinde ipsam carnem simul eum Divinitate adorandum. Legimus quoque in sermonibus Leonis Papae quod caro nostri generis caro est Deitatis et quod vera Divinitas veris se humane carnis sensibus induit.

¹ Matt. 16:13 ff.; Mark 8:27 ff.; Luke 9:18 ff.

² John 17:5.

³ Cf. Luke 1.

⁴ Matt. 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4; John 1:23; Isa. 40:3.

⁵ Ps. 18:6.

⁶ Mark 1:2.

⁷ Cf. Isa. 9:6; Ezek. 32:19; Eccles. 24:39.

⁸ Luke 1:15.

⁹ Ps. 144:3.

¹⁰ Gen. 18:6.

¹¹ Phil. 2:9.

¹² Leo I, 440-61. Cf. *Sancti Leonis Magni Romani Pontificis Opera*, curantibus P. et H. Balleriniis, Venetiis,

1753; Tom. I, col. 113, sermo 31 (the first sermon on Epiphany); cf. sermo 3 in Epiphania, Cap. II.

¹³ The Council of Ephesus, 431. Cf. MANSI, Vol. IV, col.

1092. A provincial synod, which met in Alexandria under the presidency of Cyrillus, bishop of Alexandria, wrote a letter to Nestorius, in which twelve of his heresies were anathematized. Of these twelve anathemas the one here quoted is the eighth. The synod demanded that Nestorius renounce his heresies and subscribe to these anathemas. Gerhoh quotes the translation of this synodical letter which was made by Dionysius Exiguus.

Legimus et in omelia Gregorii Papae Divinitatem calciatam. Legimus in Johanne *verbum carnem factum*.¹ Legimus in Hylario naturam inferiorem in naturam superiorem et natam et gloriificatam. Quibus omnibus persuasi carnem deifiebat et super omnes creaturas in Deo exaltatam adoramus. Quod nequaquam oporteret si, ut novi doctores asserunt, homo in solam personalem proprietatem assumptus Divinitatis in se veritatem non haberet (37). Quod et ipsi fatentur carnem, videlicet Christi, non adorandam. Unde mihi a quodam discipulorum magistri Gilberti² fuit objectum quasi pro crimine ydolatrie quod carnem Christi adoro et adorandam doceo. Ego autem non ita Christum scindo ut aliud dicam carnem Christi quam carnem Christum, aliud carnem verbi aliud carnem verbum, dicente Hylario in libro XI: *Ascendit filius hominis ubi erat prius et quis sensus percipiet? Descendit de celo filius hominis qui in celis est et que hec ratio praestabit? Verbum caro factum est.³ Fit caro verbum, id est, homo Deus. Que hec verba loquentur?* Item, Ambrosio in ymno paschali dicente:

“*Culpat caro, purgat caro,
Regnat Deus, Dei caro,*”⁴

confidenter praedico Dei carnem, sive mavis dicere, Deum carnem, in verbo, quod caro factum est, adorari oportere; neque in hoc est ullus error ydolatrie. Potes mihi ostendere Christi carnem humanam sine verbo? Quam si adoravero ero ydolater quia talis *caro non prodest quicquam*.⁵ Sed carnem verbi sine verbo monstrari aut a verbo distingui omnino est impossibile, quoniam caro, quam sine verbo intellexeris, non caro verbi aut caro verbum dicenda seu credenda est, ac proinde minime adoranda. Sane quod ait Ieronimus, (38) “verbum verbum est et non caro, et caro caro est et non verbum,” non sic est intelligendum quod carnem verbi a verbo separaverit, sed hoc dicto utriusque permanentiam demonstravit, verbi scilicet et carnis, quia et caro verbo unita permansit caro, et verbum carni unitum permansit verbum, ut erat in principio, facta tamen verbi et carnis, Dei et hominis, assumptis et assumpti, tam ineffabili unione ut, sicut dicit Leo Papa,⁶ *cum suo creatori creatura esset unita, nichil assumpto divinum, nichil assumpti deesset humanum.* Idem, loquens de passione Domini⁷ sic ait: *Cuius utique inanis fuisset species et nulli profutura imago tolerantie nisi vera Divinitas veris se humane carnis sensibus induisset et unus Dei atque hominis filius, aliunde intemerabilis, aliunde passibilis, mortale nostrum per suum immortale renovaret.* His atque aliis apostolice doctrine testimonis de Divinitate hominis assumpti confirmata, non errat ecclesia hominem adorans quem Petrus apostolus Christum *filium Dei viri confitetur*,⁸ quia filius Dei per generationem non per adoptionem factus ei *ex semine David secundum carnem*⁹ non potest non esse Deus, quomodo nec Pater eius potest non esse Deus. Unde unacum Patre atque in Patre suo est adorandus homo, Dei filius (39) et Deus factus. Factus est enim Deus, Dei filius, ex semine David¹⁰ secundum carnem, qui semper Deus fuit secundum eternam Divinitatem. Factor, ut erat, permansit, sed factus quod non erat, esse cepit. Increatum permansit ac permanet increatulum, et quod creatum est permanet creatum. Sed inerat nature gloria tota in Christo create nature data est pro *nomen, quod est super omne nomen*¹¹ datum non verbo assumpti sed homini assumpto. Quia verbum numquam non habuit hoc nomen, quod quidem datum est homini primitus in conceptione, deinde in clarificatione. Sed plene manifestabitur in ultima resurrec-

¹ John 1:14.

² Gilbertus Porretanus, 1070-1154, was accused of heretical teachings in regard to the Trinity and the person of Jesus. St. Bernard succeeded in bringing him to trial, first in Paris, afterward in the Council at Rheims, 1148-9, but was unable to secure his condemnation. For his writings see MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vols. LXIV and CLXXXVIII.

³ John 1:14.

⁴ I have not been able to find these words in any collection of the hymns of St. Ambrose. They are found in

the hymn *Acterne Rex Altissime*, which is appointed to be sung on Ascension day. Its authorship is uncertain, although Gerhoff attributes it to St. Ambrose.

⁵ John 6:64.

⁶ Leo I. *Sermo XII, de passione Domini.*, cap. I.

⁷ Leo I. *Sermo XIV, de passione Domini.*, cap. II. By no means correctly quoted.

⁸ Matt. 16:16.

⁹ Rom. 1:3.

¹⁰ Rom. 1:3.

¹¹ Phil. 2:9.

tione cum perficietur quod Ysayas praenuntiavit dicens: *Et erit lux luna sic tux solis, et lux soitis erit septempliciter sicut lux septem dierum in die qua attigaverit Dominus vulnus populi sui et percussuram plague eius sanaverit.*¹ Quenam est luna que tunc lucebit sicut sol absque varietatibus clementi et detrimenti, quibus nunc variatur in isto seculo, nisi ecclesia que tunc erit similis soli suo Deo? *Scimus*, inquit idem Iohannes, *quit cum apparuerit similes ei erimus quoniam videbimus eum sicuti est.*² Ipsa autem lux solis quanta erit? “*Sicut lux septem dierum,*” inquit. Quod est dicere, quante claritatis erat Deus verbum cum sex dierum ficerent opera omnia et septimo die completerentur omnia per ipsum, tante in carne sua tunc erit apud Deum patrem suum. Hoc enim et ipse orans dicebat. *Et nunc clarifica me, tu, Pater, apud temetipsum, claritate, quam habui priusquam esset mundus apud te.*³ Adoremus igitur Christum, solem iusticie, lumen de lumine, in divinitate sua lumen illuminans, non illuminatum; sed in humanitate sua illuminatum pariter et illuminans omnem hominem venientem in lumen mundum,⁴ utpote iam non sub modio positum, sed super candelabrum.⁵ Vide nunc, rogo, quam in alto posita est hec lucerna de testa cristallina humanitatis et igne divinitatis perfecta, que, cum sit lumen de lumine, nichil minus habet eo lumine de quo est. Ipsa quoque testa inde ignita totum habet lumen de quo et ipsa est lumen. Sicut enim in divinitate tres personas dicimus unum Deum simplicissimum, sic in incarnationis mysterio dicimus tres essentias, unum Christum, unam in trinitate personam, cuius in proprietatem cum sit homo assumptus, ita ut dicatur et sit Dei filius, quod est nomen proprium unius persone, in trinitate absque dubio credendum et confitendum est cum persone proprietate persone quoque (41) divinitatem pervenisse in hominem qui, sicut personaliter, accepta filiatione Dei, vere dicitur et est filius Dei, sic etiam substantialiter, accepta divinitate, filius⁶ Dei Deus dicitur et est. Personarum quippe proprietates, ut ante nos dictum est, non aliud quam personas ipsasque, non aliud quam unum Deum, unam divinam substantiam, unam divinam naturam, unam divinam et summam maiestatem, catholica fides confitetur. Unde et si dividere quis conetur vel personas a substantia, vel proprietates a personis, nescio quomodo trinitatis se profiteri cultorem possit, qui in tantam rerum numerositatem exesset. Dicamus itaque tres, sed non ad praeiudicium unitatis. Dicamus unum sed non ad confusionem trinitatis. Neque enim nomina vacua sunt nec absque significantia casse voces. Querit quis quomodo hoc possit esse, sufficiat ei tenere sic esse. Atque hoc non rationi perspicuum nec tamen opinioni ambiguum, sed fidei persuasum. *Sacramentum hoc magnum est*⁷ et quidem venerandum non serutandum. Quomodo pluralitas in unitate et hac unitate ut ipsa in pluralitate, serutari hoc temeritas est, credere pietas est *nosse vita et vita eterna est.* (42) Nosse autem non est huius vite sed credere unitatem in trinitate, ac trinitatem in unitate, non solum in Deo sed etiam in Christo, in homine scilicet sic nunc ut anima et caro et utrinque unctio, que divinitas est, sit quedam trinitatis representatio et summe trinitatis quodammodo ab oppositis imitatio. Ibi namque tres persone una est essentia; hie, tres essentie una sunt persona. Ibi due persone habent ab una quicquid possunt, nec tamen ideo minus possunt quia unius cum ea omnipotentes sunt. Hie due essentie habent a tercia quicquid possunt quia unius cum ea omnipotentes sunt, iuxta sensum Leonis Papae dicentis, quod praemisimus, quia quod erat in substancialiis proprium non erat in potestate diversum. Ibi una persona duarum est connexio. Hie duarum essentiarum, divinitatis scilicet atque carnis, anima rationalis est quasi copula, quoniam, ea mediante, divinitas est carni unita. Ibi a veris adoratoribus *adoratur Pater in spiritu et veritate.*⁸ Hic item a veris adoratoribus adoratur divinitas in anima et carne. Ibi nec Pater filius, nec filius Pater est, aut spiritus sanctus, et tamen in patre totus filius et totus in verbo pater atque in ambobus totus amborum spiritus. Hic neque divinitas caro, neque caro divinitas, (43) neque amborum, quasi copula, rationalis anima vel divinitas vel caro est nominanda, et tamen in singulis horum totus Christus usque adeo indivisus,

¹ Isa. 30:26.² John 3:2.⁵ Matt. 5:15; Mark 4:21; Luke 8:16, 11:33.³ John 17:5.⁴ John 1:9.⁶ MS., filii.⁷ Eph., 5:32.⁸ John 4:23 f.

ut per solam animam Christus in infernum descendisse, per solum corpus Christus mortuus et sepultus, per solam divinitatem verbo quidem imatam, earni vero et anime datam, semper ubique totus praesens creditur Christus, qui ad hoc descendit et ascendit ut adimpleret omnia. Si enim sol iste qui visibilis est ad hoc descendit et ascendit ut suo splendore contingat vel impleat omnia sub se posita, quid mirum de sole iusticie cognoscente oecastum suum et ascende ad orientem, hoc est, ad ipsam divinitatem, si affirmatur *adimplere omnia*¹ sub se posita, non utique corporali sed spirituali magnitudine, attingens a fine usque ad finem, fortiter illuminans omnia ita ut etiam in tenebris luceat quamquam *tenebre illum non comprehendant*,² quia ipse videt omnia quamquam non videatur ab omnibus, homo in Deum clarificatus et una in trinitate persona factus? Ibi principalis unitas trium personarum, hic principalis unio trium essentiarum. Inde constat, ut Leo dicit, humanam divinamque naturam in unitate venerandam, quia unio inferioris nature ad summam, quasi aeris ad lucem, representat oculis fidei unam diem.

V. DE DIE SANCTIFICATO

Et hec est dies quam, suo (44) splendore nubem carnis implente, fecit Dominus, quemadmodum sol iste visibilis, nubem sive aerem suo splendore implendo, temporalem diem facit. *Hic est dies*³ *sanctificatus, quem pater sanctificavit, et misit in mundum*, et vos, Iudeorum suppares, dicitis blasphemiam si quis illi assignat claritatem divinam, *quam etiam habuit apud patrem*⁴ et accepit apud matrem, habuit in divinitate, accepit in humanitate ita ut humanitas et divinitas veneranda sit in unitate unius claritatis, unius glorie, unius potestatis. *Poteslatem*, inquit, *habeo ponendi animam meam et iterum sumendi eam*.⁵ Vox ista vox carnis est, que animam suam potenter posuit, potenterque resumpsit, nam neque animam semetipsam posuit neque divinitas, etiam intercedente morte, vel ab anima vel a corpore separata fuit. Cuius potentia in anima simul et carne permanxit per quam et anima infernum debellare, et corpus et ipsam animam iterum sumere potuit, potentia ineffabili, potentia mirabili, potentia non accidentaliter et separabili, sed substantialiter et inseparabili. Alioquin sine divinitatis potentia *earo* separatim intellecta non prodesset quicquam⁶ comedentibus eam, neque humanitas in sua-(45)tura divinitati ulla tenus est comparanda, cuius respectu dicitur Christus minor patre secundum humanitatem. Sed cum adtenditur non simpliciter earo, *que non prodest quicquam* sed earo verbi, earo Dei, deificata et glorificata, sedens in dextra Dei patris in gloria summa, rationabile iudicatur obsequium, quod in excelso throno adorat multitudo angelorum virum, cuius imperium non deest in eternum.

VI. DE VIRO ADORANDO

O nefas! Angeli super celos celorum adorant virum et rane in luto coaxantes negant illum adorandum secundum quod vir dicitur, soli divinitati sic assignantes adorationem, ut ab ea separent ipsius humanitatem, contra doctrinam sanctorum patrum in synodo Ephesina, ut supra memoratum est, praeципientium ut utriusque nature in Christo una fiat adoratio, sed huiusmodi ranarum strepitu contempto, nos adtendamus veneranda sanctorum patrum testimonia quod affirmamus affirmantia, hoc scilicet, quod Jesus Christus in gloria Dei patris est, non solum secundum naturam altissimam eternaliter, sed etiam secundum naturam temporaliter quidem creatam, sed eterne divinitatis *gloria et honore coronatam*⁷ ac proinde in gloria quam accepit, simul cum divinitate adorandam adoratione indissimili et prorsus equali, quoniam hominis⁸ nature (46) unita verbi natura contulit illi *omnem altitudinem divitiarum*⁹ paternarum. Quid enim deest huic viro in excelso throno sedenti de cunctis divitiis celi? Omnia sibi tradita sunt a patre cum hoc ei tradidit ut ipse non per adoptionem sed per generationem pater eius sit.

¹ Eph. 4:10.

² John 1:5.

⁴ John 17:5.

⁵ John 10:18.

³ Ps. 117:24, confused with phrases from the gospel of St. John.

⁶ John 6:64.

⁷ Heb. 2:9.

⁸ Ms. homini.

⁹ Rom. 11:33.

Habet igitur omnia sibi tradita,¹ non seorsum a patre, sed in patre, quia, ut ecclesia canit, in patre totus filius et totus in verbo pater, ac proinde in patre habet quecumque ipse pater habet. Verbi gratia, pater habet sub se omnia condita, homo in Dei filium natus, *gloria et honore coronatus*² et super opera manuum patris constitutus, eadem sub se habet omnia. Pater habet in se verbum potentissimum, per quod omnia, quecumque voluit, potuit et fecit. Homo, Dei filius, habet in se idem verbum, per quod et ipse omnia, quecumque voluit, potuit et fecit et adhuc potest ac facit in celo et in terra. Pater habet illud verbum sibi connaturale, homo in Deum assumptus habet idem verbum, non solum unitum sue persone, sed etiam coadunatum sue nature. Tantam denique tamque expressam unionis vim in se praefert ea persona, in qua Deus et homo unus est Christus, ut si duo illa de se invicem praedices, non erraveris, Deum videlicet hominem, et hominem Deum, vere catholiceque (47) promuntians. Non autem similitur vel carnem de anima, vel animam de carne, nisi absurdissime praedicas, etsi similiter anima et caro unus sit homo. Nec mirum si non equi potens anima sit sua illa vitali et valida intentione coniectere atque suis effectibus astringere carnem ut sibi divinitas illum hominem qui praedestinatus est filius Dei in virtute. Longa catena et fortis ad stringendum divina praedestinatio. Ab eterno est enim. Quid longius eternitate? Quid divinitate fortius? Inde est quod nec, morte incidente, ullatenus intercedi hec unitas potuit etsi carne et anima ab invicem separatis. Et fortassis hoc sensit ille qui se indignum professus est solvere *corrigiam calcamenti eius*.³ Habet igitur, ut dixi, homo assumptus verbum patri connaturale coadunatum sue nature, quia et Deus in se hominem assumpsit et homo in Deum transivit, non versibilitate nature, sed Dei dignatione hominem in sui divinam dignitatem provehente. Item, pater habet in se spiritum sanctum de se procedentem, homo assumptus habet eundem cum omni plenitudine gratie et veritatis in se requiescentem. Habet pater potestatem iudicandi omnia, sed et omne (48) *iudicium dedit filio*⁴ in humanitate, quod eternaliter habuit in divinitate.

VII. OPPOSITIO

Quid contra hec dicere habet sapientia carnis, que *inimica est Deo?*⁵ Quid hic loci habent eorum versutie, qui contra hec locuntur, dicentes: *Si divinitas est incarnata, que non est aliud quam divinitas patris, ergo pater est incarnatus.* Ad quod respondemus quia qui hec dicunt, filium Dei concedunt incarnatum; sed filius Dei patris non est aliud quam ipse pater, licet sit alius quam pater. Consequitur ergo iuxta sensum eorum, filio incarnato, patrem quoque incarnatum esse. Respondent: *Filius est nomen proprietatis, que non est eadem vel item cum proprietate patris, et ideo non consequitur, proprietate hac incarnata, que ad filium Dei pertinet, patrem quoque incarnatum esse, qui alias proprietatem habet secundum quam pater dicitur.* Respondemus: Proprietas filii, quam conceditis incarnatam, vel idem est quod filius vel aliud. Si est aliud quam filius, ergo, secundum vos, non est incarnatus filius, sed, ut dicere soletis, proprietas eius forinsecus ei affixa est incarnata, et filii divinitas ab incarnatione penitus est aliena. Quod si verum esse constiterit non est unde salus hominum sperari possit, que (49) in eo maxime constitit, quod, ut dixit Gregorius, divinitas calciata in *Idumeam extendit calcamentum suum.* Neque enim secundum vos divinitas est calciata humanitate si non est incarnata.

VIII. SOLUTIO

Hic adtendum quod filius non est nomen proprietatis abstractim considerate, sed ipsius divinitatis cum quadam proprietate, ut cum dicimus, "Deus de Deo," "lumen de lumine," significamus filii personam sua proprietate a patre distinctam, quam etiam praedicamus incarnatam, non aliud intelligendo per substantiam filii quam ipsum filium, sicut nec proprietatem filii concedimus aliud esse quam ipsum filium, ne forte incidamus errorem illorum, qui Deum

¹ Matt. 11:27; Luke 10:22.

² Heb. 2:9.

⁵ Rom. 8:7.

³ John 1:27.

⁴ John 5:22.

⁶ Ps. 59:10, 107:10.

asserunt compositum, neque tamem concedimus, filio incarnato, patrem quoque incarnatum credi oportere, quia hoc alienum est a catholica fide. Licet enim carnem Christi pater et spiritus sanctus repleverit, non tamen susceptione, sed maiestate, id factum credimus quia neque pater neque spiritus sanctus est incarnatus, quamvis tota divinitatis natura in una sui persona sit incarnata, sicut et tota humanitatis natura in una Christi persona est deificata, aliis personis tam divinitatis quam humanitatis a sacramento incarnationis omnino sequestratis. Christus enim sicut est persona divina sic est etiam persona humana, id est, ipse sine persone geminatione vel duplicatione, consistens ex (50) duabus et in duabus naturis, adorandus in utraque, quoniam, sicut beatus Augustinus dicit, et Deus in homine et homo in Deo est adorandus. Neque tamen adoratio ista, qua creaturam in Christo adoramus, ydolatria est, quia creatura ista creatori unita una est adoratione cum eo veneranda et honoranda.

IX. DE DIADEMATE SALEMONIS

Si enim regem Salemone, Deum, Dei filium, fabricatorem celi et terre, iure adoramus in diademate quo coronavit eum mater sua,¹ quomodo non eundem hominem hominis filium, fabricatorem totius ecclesie non adoremus in diademate quo coronavit eum pater suus? Mater coronavit Deum corona humanitatis igne sancti spiritus conflat ac fabricat. Pater coronavit hominem gloria et honore divine claritatis increase simul et immense. Mater Syon dicet homo filio Dei. Pater Deus filium hominis dicit filium suum, contestans hominem esse Deum, cui dicit: *Tu es Filius dilectus in quo mihi complacui.*² Non dicit: *Tu placuisti*, quod etiam cuilibet sanctorum diei potest, qui placens Deo dilectus est, sed, *In te*, ait, *mihi complacui*, quia in te manens extra te mihi placere non potui. Ego pater qui extra te filium numquam fui, cetera creata videns extra me laudavi eo quod erant valde bona;³ te videns intra me laudo bonum, non accidental dono, sed essentiali (51) bono, quo et quanto *nemo bonus nisi solus Dens.*⁴ Ideo in te mihi complacui, quia bonitatem meam totam in te aspexi et dilexi etiam ante mundi constitutionem, cum ante creationem hominum *luderes in orbe terrarum et delicie tue fuissent esse cum filiis hominum.*⁵ Egredientes *filie Syon vident regem Salemone*⁶ in diademate quo coronavit eum mater sua. Filie namque sunt et non filii, sola exteriora videntes que de matre sua habet Deus, non interiora, que de patre suo habet homo, cui et dixit ipse pater, *ego ero illi in patrem et ipse erit mihi in filium,*⁷ quod evidenter claret homini potius assumpto quam verbo assumpti promissum, quia verbum numquam non fuit patri Deo filius, neque ipse pater fuit unquam ei non pater, quia sicut numquam fuit non Deus, ita numquam fuit non pater. Homini ergo in Deum, Dei filium, assumendo facta est illa patris promissio, quam commemo [ra] vimus, et hec altera. *Ipse invocabit me, pater meus es tu et ego primogenitum ponam illum excelsum prae regibus terrae.*⁸ Et ponam in seculum seculi sedem eius et thronum eius sicut dies celi.⁹ Et sedes eius sicut sol in conspectu meo et sicut lux perfecta in eternum.¹⁰ Propter hec et similia contemplanda ingredimini, filii Syon, et videte regem Salemone in diademate quo coronavit eum pater suus dignatione inestimabili, hominem dignum iudicans accipere omnia, que verbum eternaliter habuit. Unde non adulazione falsa sed laude verissima canit ecclesia. *Dignus est agnus qui occisus est accipere virtutem et divinitatem et sapientiam et fortitudinem et honorem et gloriam et benedictionem.*¹¹ Que omnia verbum eternaliter habuisse non dubitatur, sed homo assumptus eadem plenarie (52) accepisse cum gratiarum actione memoratur, quia totum, quod verbum habuit per naturam, datum est homini per gratiam, virtus scilicet qua invictissimus, divinitas qua Deus est, sapientia qua eque ut pater novit omnia praeterita, praesentia et futura, fortitudo qua potest omnia quecumque vult eque ut pater omnipotens honor et

¹ That is, the body of Christ.⁵ Prov. 8:31.⁶ Song of Songs 3:11.² Matt. 3:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22; 2 Peter 1:17.⁷ 2 Kings 7:14; 1 Chron. 17:13; Heb. 1:5.³ Gen. 1:10, 12, 18, etc.⁸ Ms. e. p. r. t.⁹ Ms., s. d. celi.⁴ Matt. 19:17; Luke 18:19; Mark 10:18.¹⁰ Ps. 88:27 ff.¹¹ Rev. 5:12.

gloria regni omnium seculorum et dominationis in omni generatione et generatione, benedictio qua dedit illi Deus sacerdotum magnum et beatificavit illum in gloria *fungi sacerdotio et habere laudem in nomine ipsius.*¹ *Ipse est enim benedictus qui solus venit in nomine Domini;*² taliter scilicet ut sit nomen eius Dominus, non solum in illa natura, qua invisibilis permanxit, sed etiam in illa qua visibilis venit.

X. DE AUREA LAMINA

Unde hic pontifex non solum in aurea lamina³ super caput eius posita expressum habet signum sanctitatis, nomen Dei fulgens in fronte, scilicet in superiore ipsius natura, caput enim Christi Deus, verum etiam in vestimento et in femore suo scriptum habet, rex regum et Dominus dominantium.⁴ Vedit hoc Petrus apostolus, qui, de filio hominis interrogatus, ait: *Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi.*⁵ Petri quoque successor Leo Papa id ipsum fide Petri eruditus agnoscit dicens in sermone ad populum:⁶ *Deus, Dei filius, de sempiterno et ingenito patre unigenitus, sempiternus manens, in forma Dei incommutabiliter atque in temporaliter habens non aliud esse quam pater, formum servi sine detimento sue maiestatis accepit, ut in sua nos proverberet, non in nostra deficeret.* Unde utrique nature, in suis proprietatibus permanenti tanta est unitatis facta communio, ut quicquid ibi Dei est, non sit ab homine separatum, et quicquid est (53) hominis non sit a divinitate divisum. Item idem:⁷ *Absint a cordibus vestris dilirium diabolicarum inspirationum virulenta mendacia; et scientes quod sempiterna filii divinitas nullo apud patrem ererit augmento, prudenter advertite quod cui nature in Ada dictum est: Terra es et in terram ibis,⁸ eidem in Christo dicitur: Sede a dextris meis⁹.* Secundum illam naturam, qua Christus equalis est patri, numquam inferior fuit unigenitus sublimitate generatoris. Nec temporalis ei est cum patre gloria, qui ipsa est duxera Dei patris, de qua in Exodo dicitur: *Duxera tu a Domine glorificata est in virtute.*¹⁰ Et in Ysaya: *Domine, quis credidit auditi nostro et brachium Domini cui revelatum est?*¹¹ Idem quoque ut nomen Domini tam in vestimento et in femore quam in capitib; aurea corona etiam populo videndum et legendum proponeret in sermone ad populum de Epiphania (Leo) dicit inter cetera:¹² Adorant itaque magi Dominum et offerunt munera ut impleretur quod ait ille praeceps prophetarum David: *Afferte Domino patrie gentium, afferte Domino gloriam et honorem.*¹³ “Domino et Domino” quod ait, Dominum illum esse secundum Deum Dominum et secundum hominem mystico sermone declarat. Quod enim Deus est creator est mundi, quod homo est redemptor est mundi. Quomodo ergo non privilegio utriusque sub-(54)stantie Dominus est omnium Christus, qui sibi universa aut creatione aut redemptione subegit? Afferte Domino gloriam et honorem. Honoris est ergo, karissimi, quod offerunt gentiles munera, glorie quod adorant. Hec apostolice fidei saussima testimonia non ita suscipimus ut in Christo Deum et hominem, duos dominos praedieari estimemus, quia quod erat in substantiis proprium non erat in potestate diversum, ait idem Leo Papa, ut iam supra memoravimus, atque ideo verbi et hominis assumpti unum dominium, una potestas, una virtus, una sapientia, una fortitudo, una plenitudo divinitatis, que et in verbo est naturaliter et in homine assumpto inhabitat corporaliter, id est, incorporata et incarnata. Si queris quomodo id fieri potuerit audi beatum Gregorium prudentie humane ista mysteria claudentem et fidei sane aperientem. Quis, inquit, investigare potest quomodo corporatur verbum, quomodo summus et vivificator spiritus intra uterum virginis animatur? Cessa igitur investigare quomodo ista mininvestigabilia fieri potuerint et crede quod angelus virginis credendum persuasit, quia scilicet non est impossibile apud Deum omne verbum.

¹ Ms. h. l. i. n. i; Ex. 28:1; Eccles. 45:19.⁹ Ps. 109:1; Matt. 22:24; Mark 12:32; Luke 20:42.² Matt. 21:9, 23:39; Mark 11:10; Luke 13:35.¹⁰ Exod. 15:6.¹¹ Isa. 53:1; John 12:38.³ Exod. 28:38.⁴ Rev. 19:16.⁵ Matt. 16:16.¹² What follows appears to be a free paraphrase of several passages. It seems also that the copyist has omitted something.⁶ Leo I., Sermo VIII, *In Nativitate Domini*, cap. I.¹³ Ps. 95:7.⁷ Leo I., Sermo VIII, *In Nativitate Domini*, cap. VI.⁸ Gen. 3:19.

Cum ergo audis verbum carnem factum, erede hoc factum sine ipsius verbi permutatione, sed cum ineffabili (55) carnis mutatione, permanente siquidem naturalis essentie proprietate, sed acedente veteri substantie illa novitate, de qua dixit Ieremias: *Faciet novum Dominus super terrum, femina circumdabit virum.*¹

XI. DE VETERI HOMINE AO NOVO

*Primus et vetus homo de terra terrenus, secundus et novus homo de celo celestis.*² An non mirabile ac novum est hoc ut celestis homo de celo terrenam simul et celestem naturam in se habens ipsam terrenam super omnes celos in semetipso exaltaverit atque omni plenitudine divinitatis corporaliter inhabitantis ditaverit? Alieni sint a nobis, qui personam verbi a natura ipsius alienantes ita personam dicunt incarnatam ut inde separant ipsius verbi naturam. Inde est quod ipsi delirantes putant fideles delirare in canticis spiritualibus ubi canunt:

Mirabilis natura
Mirifice induita,³

assumens quod non erat, manens quod erat. Induitur natura divinitas humana. Quis audivit talia, die, rogo, facta? Talia canentibus ecclesiæ filiis in incarnatione Dei gloriantibus illi movent risum, nescio quam personam fingentes incarnatam, que, ut illi dicunt, non est substantia divina, eum nec persona hominis aliquatenus fingi possit, que non sit substantia rationalis. Evidem et hoc ipsi fatentur esse descriptionem persone, substantia rationalis individua.

XII. DE PERSONIS

Que descriptio tam divinis quam et humanis personis adaptatur, quoniam sicut Petrus, Paulus, et Andreas tres humanæ personæ sunt, quarum quisque substantia rationalis est, ita pater et filius et spiritus sanctus tres divine sunt personæ, quarum quisque substantia rationalis est. Et potest quidem aliquomodo significari substantia (56) sine persona, ut cum dicimus: Deus est ineffabilis maiestas continens omnia creata, vel homo est omnis creatura secundum quod dicitur: *Praedicate evangelium omni creature.*⁴ In istis enim propositionibus natura supposita est non persona vel Dei vel hominis, quamquam extra personas nec Dei nec hominis naturam invenias, licet eam sine respectu personali vel supponere vel praedicare competenter valeas. Verum personas extra substantias vel naturas suas velle significare nichil est aliud quam delirare, ut, verbi gratia, si patris personam in trinitate intelligas, vel intelligendam suadeas non esse Deum, aut Petri personam non esse hominem. Propterea tam in theologia quam in phisica rectius praedicamus substantiam de persona quam personam de substantia, quamquam interdum videatur in divinis praedicatum et substantia subpositum, ut eum dicimus immensus pater, immensus filius, immensus et spiritus sanctus, item eternus pater, eternus filius, eternus et spiritus sanctus, item, omnipotens pater, omnipotens filius, omnipotens et spiritus sanctus, item, increatus pater, increatus filius, increatus et spiritus sanctus. Istis enuntiationibus videntur persone praedicari et substantia supponi. Verum non ita est, quoniam convenientius de unoquoque trium praedicatur quod sit omnipotens, eternus, immensus, increatus, absque omni falsitatis scrupulo, quam si de eterno, immenso, increato, et omnipotente praedices personas. Unde ubi dicit Iohannes: *Deus erat verbum,*⁵ tractatores huius dicti asserunt verbum supponi, Deum praedicari. Et recte nimur, quia supposita persona inevitabiliter coherens intelligitur persone substantia, ut Petrus est homo, Paulus est homo, Andreas est homo. Item, pater est Deus, filius est Deus, spiritus sanctus est Deus. Homine autem vel Deo supposito, ut verbi gratia, si dicas, homo est Petrus, Deus est pater, vera quidem est connexio, sed (57) inconsequens. Non

¹Jer. 31:22.

²1 Cor. 15:47.

⁴Mark 16:15.

⁵John 1:1.

³I have not been able to discover from what poem these lines are quoted.

enim quem hominem esse proposueris consequenter Petrum affirmare poteris, quemadmodum quem Petrum esse proponis consequenter hominem inevitabili veritate intelligis. Ita etiam in theologia, quem patrem proponis, hunc Deum omnipotentem, eternum, immensum, increatum consequenter intelligere debes. At non ita quem omnipotentem Deum, eternum, immensum, proponis consequenter esse patrem est inevitabile, cum possit aut filius aut spiritus sanctus ibidem intelligi. Et est quidem veritas in propositione, qua dicitur, Deus est pater, sed est inconsequentia in locutione. Inconsequentia tamen locutionum non auferit veritatem dictorum. Necesse est autem esse inconsequentia locutionis ubi non fuerit consequentia suppositionis, neque tamen praeiudicat veritati dictorum inconsequens connexionio dictionum. Est ergo verum si dixero, immensus pater, id est, qui immensus est ipse pater est, ut immensus habeatur pro subiecto, et pater pro praedicato, sed est inconsequens connexionio dictionum, dum substantia, que trium communis est, subiectur et persona singularis praedicatur, que ad tale subiectum necessario non connectitur, cum et alia persona de illo possit intelligi. At si, ut ratio conexionis exigit, persona supponatur, quicquid connaturales persone habent substantiale, totum inevitabiliter connectitur uni persone supposito, ut pater est immensus, omnipotens, eternus, et cetera huiusmodi. Item Petrus est homo, animal, corpus. Que connexionio communium praedicatorum ad singularia subiecta ita est inevitabilis, ut quicquid de singulari persona qualibet supposita praedicamus, etiam de qualibet eius regulari praedicato praedicare possis, ut, verbi (58) gratia, si vere proposueris Petrum esse crucifixum, consequenter inferre poteris hominem et animal et corpus et Christianum et apostolum crucifixum. Non autem e converso, si proposueris hominem vel apostolum vel Christianum esse crucifixum, poteris inferre Petrum crucifixum, licet hoc verum sit, quoniam eadem ratione probaretur et Paulus crucifixus, quod falsum est. Eodem modo si proponas Deum. Dominum glorie, crucifixum non inde consequitur filium Dei esse crucifixum, licet hoc verum sit, quoniam, si hoc esset consequens, eadem ratione probaretur et pater crucifixus, quod falsum est. Proposito autem, quod filius Dei sit crucifixus, inevitabiliter consequitur Deum, Dominum glorie, crucifixum. Hinc est quod, filio Dei incarnato et passo, consequenter et confidenter asserimus Deum omnipotentem incarnatum et passum. Neque tamen, Deo incarnato et passo, consequitur patrem aut spiritum sanctum esse incarnatum, sicut, homine crucifixo, non est consequens Paulum vel Iohannem esse crucifixum. Frustra ergo laborant novi doctores huius temporis idecireo Dei substantiam sequestrando ab incarnatione ne, hac incarnata, videatur pater incarnatus et spiritus sanctus, quorum una est cum filio substantia, ut fides habet catholica, quia sicut in humanis, cum tota humanitatis natura sit in una sui persona, [tantum] illa paciente vel moriente, non necesse est alias eisdem nature personas compati vel conmori. Sic in divinis, cum tota divinitatis natura sit in una qualibet sui persona, illa paciente vel moriente, non necesse est alias eisdem nature personas compati vel conmori. Passo igitur Deo, Dei filio, (59) non inde consequitur patrem quoque passum esse, ut voluerunt Sabelliani,¹ qui et a nomine sui erroris Patriconfessiani dicti sunt. In hoc permaxime decepti quod essentie uni atque, ut illi voluerunt, singulari tres proprietates attribuerunt, ita dicentes unus idemque Deus, quando vult, pater est, quando vult, filius, et quando vult, spiritus sanctus est, atque ita filio passo, consequens arbitrabantur etiam patrem passum.

XIII. DE NOVIS SEMISABELLIANIS

Novi autem Semisabelliani et ipsi quoque essentiam Dei singularem praedicant et hoc nomen singularitatis magistri Gisilberti scripta super Boetium et apostolum frequenter inculcent. Ne autem sint omnino ad plenum Sabelliani, tres trium personarum proprietates essentie Dei, ut aiunt, singulari minime attribuunt, sed eas forinsecus affixas dicunt, nec eas Deum esse concedunt. Naturales inquiunt persone his, quibus unaqueque est aliquid, prius a se invicem sunt alie ut de his per hec a se aliis deinde huiusmodi extrinsecens affixa praedicamenta dicantur,

¹ Sabellius, *flor.* in the first half of the third century, was the head of that group of theologians who declared in favor of a modal trinity.

quorum oppositione, et si non sint alia, recte tamen eorum, quibus sunt, oppositione probantur esse alia. Theologice vero persone, quoniam eius, quo sunt, singularitate unum sunt, et simplicitate id quod sunt essentiarum oppositione a se invicem alie esse non possunt, sed harum que dictae sunt extrinsecus affixarum rerum oppositione, a se invicem alie et probantur et sunt. Hec et similia magister Gillibertus in (60) suis glosis in Boetium dicens, deitatis unius tres personas vel earum proprietates asserit forinsecus affixas. Hoc dicendo, a Sabellianis dissentiens et eisdem in eo consentiens quod trium personarum essentiam praedicat singularem, quo dicto excludit patris et filii substantialem similitudinem et coequalitatem. Singularitas enim admittit vel similitudinem vel coequalitatem, quam bene admittit unitas. Atque ideo ne similitudinis aut equalitatis inter patrem et filium significatio perimeretur, singularitas reprobata et unitas commendata est ab orthodoxis doctoribus. Quod sanctus Hylarius in epistola de synodis affirmit hec inter cetera dicens.¹ *Secundum essentiam et virtutem et gloriam patri filius similis est—Ita similitudo proprietas est, proprietas equalitas est, et equalitas nichil differt. Que autem nichil differunt unum sunt, non unione persone, sed unitate substantie.* Idem, *unam substantiam proprietatis similitudinem intelligamus ut quod unum sunt non singularem significet, sed equeales—Equalitas autem nature non potest esse nisi una sit, una vero non persone unitate, sed generis.*

XIV. DE SIMILITUDINE PATRIS ET FILII

Non nos latet quosdam hereticos huius quorum errorem, ipsius auctoris tacito nomine commemorat Epiphanius,² qui sic inter patrem et filium affirmarent similitudinem ut negarent equalitatem, recipientes omeusyon,³ quod est similis essentie, repudiantes omousyon,⁴ quod est interpretatum (61) unius essentie. Quibus et consentit concilium Ariminense⁵ ab Arrianis habitum. Hos iam dictus Hylarius ostendit reprobatos in synodis orientalibus, quibus catholicci patres et omeusyon receperunt contra Sabellium et omousyon adversus Arrium;⁶ omousyon, id est, unius essentie, propter id quod dicit filius: *Ego et pater unum sumus;*⁷ omeusyon, id est, similis essentie, propter id quod dicit: *Sicut habet pater vitam in semetipso sic dedit et filio vitam habere in semetipso.*⁸ Item, *quicumque ille facit hec et filius similiter facit.*⁹ Quod autem similitudo et equalitas in Deo idem sint, praemissa Hylarii dicta confirmant ubi secundum essentiam et virtutem et gloriam patri filius et similis et equalis ostenditur, quibus omnibus in essentia divina singularitatis nomen repudiatur, dum secundum essentiam patri filius, ut dictum est, equalis ostenditur, quod nec esset nec esse posset, si essentia duorum singularis existeret. Proinde quod in dictis Ysidori,¹⁰ essentia Dei singularis dicitur, singularitatem pro simplicitate positam intelligamus, ne magnis concilii et catholicis patribus nomen singularitatis a divina usya sequestrantibus inuriam faciamus et filium patri substantialiter equalem degonare videamur. Nam quod secundum substantiam patri filius sit equalis, eum praemissa Hylarii dicta evidenter ostendant, id ipsum quoque beati Augustini dicta comprobant. Qui in libro *De Trinitate* dicit inter cetera: *Non secundum hoc, quod ad patrem dicitur, equalis est patri filius. Restat ergo ut secundum id equalis sit quod ad se dicitur. Quicquid autem ad se dicitur secundum substantiam dicitur. Restat ergo ut secundum substantiam sit equalis.* Item Hylarius in epistola de synodis ait:¹¹ *Non fallit, fratres karissimi, quosdam esse qui similitudinem confitentes negant equalitatem* (62). *Si loquantur ut volunt, et blasphemie sue virus ingerant ignorantibus. Si inter similitudinem et equalitatem differre dicunt, quero, unde comparetur equalitas? Nam quia secundum essentiam et virtutem et gloriam patri filius similis est, interrogabo, ex quo non videatur equalis? Nam etiam hec in superiori fide consti-*

¹ MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. X, cols. 529 f., par. 74-76.

⁴ The Council of Rimini, anno 359.

² Epiphanius, died 403. For his writings, cf. MIGNE, *Pat. Graecu*, Vols. XLI-XLIII.

⁵ Arius, d., 336.

⁶ John 10:30.

³ Technical terms, the catchwords of the Arian and trinitarian parties.

⁷ John 5:26.

⁸ John 5:19.

⁹ Isidorus, *De Summo Bono*, Bk., I.

¹⁰ Cf. MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. X, Cols. 528 f.

tuta dampnatio est, ut anathema esset, qui patrem et filium dissimilis sibi essentie diceret. Si ergo naturam neque atiam, neque dissimilem ei, quem impassibiliter generabat, dedit, nee potest aliam dedisse nisi propriam. Ita similitudo proprietas est, proprietas equalitas est. Et equalitas nichil differt. Que autem nichil differunt, unum sunt, non unione persone, sed equalitate substantie—Ita similitudo res ipsas naturates coequat, per similitudinem non differentis essentie. Omnis itaque filius, secundum naturalem nativitatem, equalitas patris est, quia est et similitudo nature. Et beatus Iohannes docet in natura patris et filii, quam Moyses in Seth, filio Adam ad consimilitudinem dicit, hanc equalitatem candem esse nature. Ait enim: Propter hoc eum magis querebant Iudei interficere¹ quoniam non solum solvebat sabbatum sed et patrem suum dicebat Deum, equalem se faciens Deo. Et post pauca: Per Moysen Seth Ade similitudo accepta per Iohannem filius patris equalitas est per hec pie potest quod unum sunt praedicari.

XV. QUOD FIDES EQUALITATIS ET SIMILITUDINIS ET UNITATIS IN DEO PLURIMUM CONTRA PLURES HERETICOS VALET

In his igitur, que dicta sunt, similitudo, equalitas, et unitas naturalis inter patrem et filium, que nichilominus attinet ad spiritum sancta commendata, plurimum contra plures hereticos operatur. Nam similitudo facit contra Noetum² et eius discipulum Sabellium. Itemque, contra Praxeum³ et Hermogenem⁴ et Priscillianum,⁵ qui unum eundemque (63) putant esse patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum. Quod si verum esset nulla inter eos esset similitudo. Quia ut de duobus tantum loquamur, patre videlicet ac filio, subintellecto eodem sensu de spiritu sancto, nec pater filio nec filius patri similis recte aut vere diceretur, si idem pater, qui filius, aut idem filius qui pater esset, cum similitudo non possit esse unius ad semetipsum.⁶ Item, duorum equalitas eosdem confutat hereticos, quia, dum alter alteri assurit equalis, opinio singularitatis excluditur, quam docent praedicti heretici, simulque inequalitatis, quam docent Arriani, et dissimilitudinis, quam docent Ethius⁷ et eius discipulus Eunomius.⁸ Porro unitas, qua unum sunt pater et filius, non solum confutat antiquos Arrianos inducentes duos Deos diversos, alterum increatum, alterum creatum, sed et novos Iudeos eidem unitati contradicentes. Cum enim Christus dixisset, *Ego et pater unum sumus*, intellexerunt Iudei quod non intellexerunt Arriani, quodque nondum intelligunt Iudeorum supares, novi heretici. Hoc enim dicendo Christus ostendit se unius essentie cum patre, quod Greci onousyon, Latini consubstantiam dicunt. Notandum vero quod cum hic sensus de divinitate verbi offenderit Arrianos non inde offendebat Iudeos, quippe (64) de genitura verbi nullam fidem habentes. Arriani quippe negant Christum in divinitate sua unum esse cum patre, unius videlicet substantie, vel essentie, quod utique a Iudeis sicut non est creditum ita non invenimus denegatum, ubi Christus se testatus est esse unum cum patre, neque adhuc denegant eorum semipedissequi, equanimiter cum catholica ecclesia hoc recipientes, quod Christus, in divinitate sua similis et equalis patri, nnum est cum eo.

XVI. DISTINCTIO INTER Iudeos ET ARRIANOS

Quid est ergo quod vel tunc offendit Iudeos vel nunc eorum sequaces? Audi ex eorum verbis. *De bono*, inquiunt, *opere non tapidamus te sed de blasphemia, et quia tu homo cum sis facis te ipsum Deum.*⁹ Igitur in hoc erat Iudeis praecipue offendiculum, quod intellexerant

¹ John 11:53.

² Noetus, *flor.* between 150-240, taught monarchianism. He was opposed by Hippolytus.

³ Cf. Tertullian, *Adversus Praxeum*.

⁴ Hermogenes, *flor.* 200 A. D., a Christian with Gnostic tendencies. Cf. Tertullian, *Adversus Hermogenem*.

⁵ Priscillianus held heretical views on the trinity. He was executed as a heretic in Trier, 385, perhaps the first Christian to suffer the death penalty for heresy.

⁶ Cf. Hil., *Epis. de Synod.*; MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. X.

⁷ Actius, a bishop in Coeseyria, a teacher of Arianism went to Alexandria where he labored to spread his doctrines.

⁸ Eunomius went to Alexandria c. 356-7, where he heard Actius, whose teachings he adopted. He died probably soon after 392.

⁹ John 10:33.

homini attribui honorem divinum. Similiter eorum sequacibus, novis doctoribus, omnino videatur absonum, quod nos homini assumpto in Deum, Dei filium, attribuimus honorem divinum confitentes eum esse ipsum Deum, utpote naturalem non adoptivum Dei filium. Quod cum et ipse confessus esset in concilio malignantium Iudeorum, *filium*, scilicet, *hominis venturum in nubibus¹* *celi cum potestate magna* et se, ut interrogatus fuerat, esse Christum, filium Dei benedicti; offensus hac ipsa confessione summus sacerdos: *Ecce, ait, audistis blasphemiam. Quid vobis videtur?*² (65) Et illi acclamantes: *Blasphemarit*, inquiunt, *quid adhuc desideramus testimonium?*³ Item, ad Pilatum: *Nos, inquiunt, Legem habemus et secundum legem nostram debet mori, quia filium Dei se fecit.*⁴ Hec et similia dicentes Iudei ostenderunt se praecepue offensos in eo quod Christus, cum homo esset, fecit se ipsum Deum, probans hoc ipsum testimoniis operum divinorum. *Si, inquit, mihi non creditis, operibus credite.*⁵ Item, cum se filium hominis ostendens dominum etiam sabbati, et potenter solveret sabbatum dixissetque: *Pater meus usquemodo operatur et ego operor,*⁶ subnecit evangelista: *Propterea ergo magis querebant eum Iudei interficere quia non solum solvet sabbatum sed et patrem suum dicebat Deum, equalem se faciens Dco.*⁷ Patrem suum dicebat Deum, quod nulli angelorum vel hominum praeter ipsum est concessum, ut videlicet patrem suum dicat Deum. Et nos quidem praeceptis salutaribus moniti et divina institutione forniati audiemus dicere Deo; *Pater noster qui es in celis;*⁸ pro nomine plurali dicendo “noster,” quia *multi* sumus per adoptionem filii *vocati, licet, pauci electi.*⁹ Solus vero filius hominis per operationem divini amoris, qui spiritus sanctus est, conceptus in virgine, veraciter potest Deum, patrem verbi sibi uniti, suum quoque patrem appellare, dicens “*pater mens*” vel (66) “*mi pater*” singulariter, non quod sit gemina filiatione verbi assumentis et hominis assumpti, sed quod in filiolitatem verbi eternaliter geniti sit homo assumptus, qui praedestinatus est filius Dei in virtute secundum spiritum sanctificationis, quo, ut diximus, operante, conceptus et natus est, angelo praetestante. *Quod enim, ait, in ea natum est de spiritu sancto est.*¹⁰ Cum igitur iste homo dicit: *Ego et pater unum sumus, equalem se faciens Deo, non rapinam arbitratus esse se equalem Deo patri, qui dedit ei esse in forma Dei,*¹¹ sed confitetur gratiam sibi prae consortibus datam, *sapientibus et prudentibus absconditam,*¹² ut videlicet cum sit homo secundum humanitatis conditionem minor patre, ut catholica fides habet, tamen secundum virtutem et gloriam eidem sue humanitati collatam sit non inferior aut minor Deo patre, quod Iudei et Iudeorum suppare nolunt recipere, arbitrantes blasphemiam esse creaturam creatori aliquomodo coequare. Quod et re vera magna est blasphemia nisi cum agitur de illa creatura, cuius magnitudo est ipsa divinitas immensa non ad mensuram illi data, *in quo habitat omnis plenitudo divinitatis corporaliter.*¹³ Cum enim ut Leo Papa dicit incorporea sit divinitas quomodo corporaliter (67) inhabitat nisi quia caro nostri generis facto est caro deitatis? Igitur incarnata in una persona ipsa divinitas contulit homini esse Deum, Deo patri equalem, quod ei conferre non potuisset persona, que Deus non esset, vel proprietas persone que, item Deus non esset, si forinsecus affixa esset deitati vel personis eius. Pereat igitur hec nova doctrina negans divinitatem incarnatam et nature humanae sensibus vestitam nostreque mortalitatis pelle calciatam. Pereant etiam proprietates ille vel persone que divina substantia non sunt et in cordibus impiorum non Deum simplicem, sed symulaerum talibus proprietatibus compositum representant mentesque ipsorum a Deo vero ac simplici alienant. Audiamus nos potius antiqua patrum testimonia non proprietatem filiationem inanem sed ipsam filii Dei personam substantivam incarnatam atque in ea carnem nostre nature deificatam, glorificatam, clarificatam et super omnes creature (68) in immensum exaltatam contestantia. Testimonium itaque Christi dicentis, *Ego et pater unum sumus,*¹⁴ diverso sensu et Arrianos et Iudeos offendit.

¹ Luke 21:27.⁷ John 5:18.⁸ Matt. 6:9.² Matt. 27:65; Mary 14:64.⁹ Matt. 20:16, 22:14.¹⁰ Matt. 1:18.³ Matt. 26:65.¹¹ Phil. 2:6.¹² Matt. 11:25.⁵ John 10:38.⁴ John 19:7.¹³ Col. 2:9.¹⁴ John 10:30.

Arriani quippe inde sunt offensi quia verbo quod erat in principio denegabant esse unum cum patre. Iudei vero inde quia homini apud se contemptibili graviter indignabantur, quod, homo cum esset, patrem suum diebat Deum, equatem se faciens Deo,¹ quod in eo intellexerant ubi dixerat, *Ego et pater unus sumus.* Et Arriani quidem iam confutati conticuerunt. Iudei vero et Indiaizantes heretici adhuc indignantur hominem assumptum in Deum, Dei filium, credi eum patre sic esse unum ut assumpto nichil divinum, et assumenti nichil desit humaum, sicut affirmat Leo Papa. Interponamus adhuc plura patrum testimonia id ipsum contestantia non (69) accidentalibus connexionibus ut illi, qui dicunt sicut coloratus intelligens dicitur propter persone unitatem, que corpore colorata mente intelligit. Sic in Christo divina homini et humana Deo attribuuntur propter persone unitatem, ut homo est Deus omnipotens et Deus ac Dominus glorie crucifixus est. Non, inquam, sic intendimus assignare vel homini divina, vel Deo humana sola personali unitate, quomodo coloratus dicitur intelligens, verum longe altius, natura inferiore in Christo, salva sui essentia, in superioris nature omnimodam virtutem et gloriam proveeta, quod est eam ad dexteram patris exaltatam esse. Non enim divinitas humanitati sie est incapabilis, ut color menti, vel intelligentia (70) corpori, sed omnino pura in Christo humanitas, *tamquam nubes candida,*² capax divini luminis et illud ei capable fuit. Propter quod *pluria* totius divinitatis *in vellus purissime*³ humanitatis descendens denuo prelo crucis expressa in concham totius mundi sparsit et spargit gracia divisivas, non inminuta vel inminuenda umquam plenitudine semel infusa homini assumpto, cuius, ut ait Iohannes, *vidimus gloriam non quasi adoptiri sed quasi unigeniti a patre pleni gratia et veritate.*⁴ Paulus quoque asserit *omnem plenitudinem divinitatis corporaliter inhabitare in Christo*⁵ et ipsum *Christum esse Dei virtutem et Dei sapientiam*,⁶ Christi nomine significans humanam et unctam naturam *prae suis consortibus unetam*,⁷ et non solum filium Dei persone unitam, (71) sed etiam ipsius filii Dei divinitati coadunatam. Unde Augustinus de verbis Domini: Adveniens divinitas in uterum virginis Marie auctoritate illa, qua, in Paradiso Adam de limo formavit, carnem sibi ex substantia ipsius Marie fabricavit, quam pro salute nostra suscepis et sibi coadunans natus est Deus et homo. Ecce in his dictis habemus de duarum naturarum coadunatione qualis non potest esse coloris ad mentem vel intelligentie ad corpus, quamquam in una persona sit et corpus coloratum et mens intelligens. Audiamus in Christo, natura inferior, licet permanente sue conditionis essentia, quounque in superioris nature gloria sit magnificata, glorificata et exaltata. Iam dictus Augustinus item de verbis Domini exponens illud *Si diligenteris me gauderetis*⁸ utique dicit inter cetera: *Nature humanae gratulandum est, eo quod sit assumpta a verbo unigenito ut immortalis constitueretur in celo atque ita fieret terra sublimis ut incorruptibilis pulvis sederet ad dexteram patris.* Hoc enim modo se iturum ad patrem dixit. Item Leo Papa in sermone ad populum:⁹ *Et re vera magna et ineffabilis erat causa gaudendi cum in conspectu sancte multitudinis super omnium creaturarum (72) celestium dignitatem humani generis naturam conseenderit, supergressura angelicos ordines, et ultra archangelorum altitudines eleveranda, nec ullis sublimitatibus modum sue profectionis habitura, nisi eterni patris recepta concessu illius glorie sociaretur in throno, cuius, nature copulabatur in filio.* Item Augustinus in *Libro Retractionum*¹⁰ dicit: *Exposui epistolam apostoli ad Galathas non earptim, id est, aliqua praetermittens, sed continuanter et totam.* Hanc expositionem uno volumine comprehendi. In quo illud quod dictum est priores ergo apostoli veraces, qui non ab hominibus, sed a Deo per hominem missi sunt per Iesum Christum, scilicet adhuc mortalem. Verax etiam norissimus apostolus, qui per Iesum Christum, totum iam Deum, post resurrectionem eius missus est, propter immortalitatem, dictum est totum iam Deum, quam post resurrectionem habere cepit, non propter divinitatem semper immortalem, a

¹ John 19:7.² Rev. 14:14.⁷ Ps. 44:8.⁸ John 14:28.³ Ps. 71:6.⁴ John 1:14.⁹ Leo I., *Sermo I, de Ascensione Domini*, cap. IV.⁵ Col. 2:9.⁶ 1 Cor. 1:24.¹⁰ S. Augustini, *Retractionum*, Liber I, cap. 24.

*qua numquam recessit, in qua totus Deus erat, et cum moriturnis adhuc erat. Hunc autem sensum sequentia manifestant. Adiunici enim dicens priores sunt certi apostoli per Christum adhuc ex parte hominem, id est, mortalem. Norissimus est autem apostolus Paulus per Christum iam totum Deum, id est, omni ex parte immortalem. Hoc enim dixi exponens quod ait, non ab hominibus neque per hominem sed per Iesum Christum et Deum patrem,¹ quasi Christus iam non sit homo. Seguitur enim, qui susevit illum a mortuis,² ut hinc appareret cur dixerit, neque per hominem, proinde propter immortalitatem iam nunc non homo Christus Deus propter substantiam, vero nature humanae cum (73) qua ascendit in celum, et nunc mediator Dei et hominum, homo Christus Iesus,³ quoniam sic veniet quomodo riederunt eum, qui riederunt eum in celum.⁴ Idem, in epistola ad Philippenses: *Homini donatum est nomen quod est super omne nomen,⁵ non Deo, ut cum forma servi⁶ nominetur unigenitus filius Dei.* Quisquis hec dieta beati Augustini fideliter legendo perspexerit sane intelligere poterit quia tantus doctor numquam sensit quod isti sentiunt, qui volunt vocari *ab hominibus Rabbi*⁷ et magistrali, ut dicitur, auctoritate astruunt hominis in Deum assumpti solam personam, non etiam naturam divinitatis habere virtutem et gloriam quasi non magis divinitatis possit esse humani spiritus et corporis quam color mentis vel intelligentia corporis. Quod si sensisset ille beatus non affirmasset pulverem sedere ad dexteram patris,⁸ cum pulvis nomen sit inferioris portionis in humana substantia. Item, cum dicit propter immortalitatem Christum iam totum Deum, claret humanam in Christo naturam talem accepisse immortalitatem per quam deificata sit plene in Deum, sicut verbum ab eterno Deus fuit, verificata sententia, que Iudeos offendit, quando ipse Christus, cum homo esset, adhuc (74) mortalis, tamen sibi conscius immortalitatis divine, quam ipsius divinitas ab eterno habuit, queque humanitati eius iam tunc in proximo cum hec loqueretur conferenda fuit, equalē se hominem faciens Deo, dixit, *Ego et pater unus sumus.*⁹ Absit ut immortalitatem solunmodo, qualem habent angeli sancti vel habituri sunt homines beati, arbitratur homini assumpto, qui filius Dei est, collatam, sed potius que soli Deo assignatur assertione apostolica, ubi dicitur, *qui solus habet immortalitatem,*¹⁰ quam intelligendam asserit beatus Gregorius divine substantie immutabilitatem, quoniam omne quod mutatur ab eo statu, in quo prius erat, moritur. Deus autem, quia nullatenus mutatur, nullatenus moritur. Quia immutabilitate sive immortalitate homo assumptus recte intelligitur, vel si non potest intelligi, sane creditur in throno patre glorie honorificatus, ubi sedet homo quiescens, regnans, iudicans, eque ut Deus pater eius. Unde non sub patre sed iuxta eum et ad dexteram eius habet sessionem, non localiter, ut uniformii putant, sed divinitus requiem et iudicandi ac dominandi habens potestatem, que recte sedes eius intelligitur.*

XVII. QUALITER FILIUS PATRIS SUBICIENDUS INTELLIGOATUR

Neque vero te moveat quod, (75) cum omnia subicerit illi Deus, ipse quoque ab apostolo affirmatur Deo subiciendus.¹¹ Lege Ambrosium in Libro ad Gracianum¹² de hac subiectione futura pie disputantem et opiniones tuas de subiectione iniuriosa fortiter exsufflantem. Dicit enim inter cetera:

Apostolicum recenseamus capitulum. "Novissime, inquit, inimicia destruetur mors omnia sub pedibus eius. Cum autem dicat, omnia subiecta sunt, ei sine dubio praetur eum, qui sibi subiecit omnia." "Videmus igitur quia nondum subiectum sed subiciendum esse scriptura commemorat." "Sicut enim si in me concupiscat caro adversus spiritum et spiritus adversus carnem, non videor esse subiectus."¹³ Ita quia omnis ecclesia unum corpus est Christi, quamdiu dissentit humanum genus Christum dividimus. Non ergo subiectus est Christus, cuius adhuc membra non sunt subiecta. Cum autem fuerimus non multa membra, sed unus spiritus, tunc et ipse subiectus erit ut per ipsius subiec-

¹ Gal. 1:1. ² Rom. 4:24. ³ 1 Tim. 2:5. ⁴ Acts 1:11. ⁹ John 10:30. ¹⁰ 1 Tim. 6:16. ¹¹ 1 Cor. 15:27 ff.

⁵ Phil. 2:9.

⁶ Phil. 2:7.

⁷ Matt. 23:7.

¹² Gerhoh here quotes detached sentences from St.

⁸ Col. 3:1; Heb. 10:12; 1 Peter 3:22; Matt. 26:64; Mark 16:19. ¹³ Gal. 5:17.

tionem sit Deus omnia in omnibus." Item post pauca:¹ "Sicut in illo per carnem illam, que est pignus nostre salutis, sedere nos in celestibus² apostolus dixit, utique non sedentes, sic et ille per nostre assumptionem nature dicitur subiectus in nobis." (76) Item, Scriptum est quia, cum mortui essemus peccatis, convivificavit nos in Christo, cuius gratia estis salvificati, et simul suscitavit simulque fecit sedere in celestibus in Christo Iesu.³ Agnosco scriptum, sed non ut homines sedere ad dexteram sibi patiatur Deus, sed ut in Christo sedere, quia ipse est omnium fundamentum, et ipse est caput ecclesie,⁴ in quo communis secundum carnem natura omnium hominum particeps honoratur. In Christo enim Deo caro in carne autem humani generis natura omnium hominum particeps honoratur. Sicut ergo nos in illo sedemus per corpore communitionem nature, ita et ille, qui per susceptionem nostre carnis maledictum pro nobis factus est,⁵ cum maledictum utique in benedictum filium Dei non cadat, ita, inquam, et ille per obedientiam omnium erit subiectus in nobis; cum gentilis crediderit, cum Iudeus agnoverit quem crucifixit, cum Manicheus adoraverit quem in carne venisse non eredit, cum Arrianus omnipotentem confessus fuerit quem negavit, cum postremo in omnibus fuerit sapientia Dei, iusticia, pax, caritas, resurrectio.⁶ Per sua igitur opera Christus et genera diversa (77) virtutum erit in nobis patri subditus, eum, viciis abdicatis et feriante delicto, unus in omnibus Deo coperit uno sensu popolorum omnium spiritus adherere, tunc erit Deus omnia in omnibus. Conclusionem igitur totius absolutionis breviter colligamus. Unitas potestatis opinionem iniuriose subiectonis excludit. Evacuatio potestatum et victoria de morte quesita triumphatoris utique non minuit potestatem. Subiectonem operatur obedientia, obedientiam Christus assumpsit, obedientia usque ad crucem,⁷ erux ad salutem. Ergo ubi opus, ibi et auctor operis. Cum igitur omnia Christo subiecta fuerint per obedientiam Christi, ut in nomine eius omne genu flectatur.⁸ Nunc enim quia non omnes credunt non videntur omnes esse subiecti. Cum ergo crediderint omnes et Dei fecerint voluntatem, erit omnia et in omnibus Christus. Cum Christus fuerit omnia et in omnibus erit omnia et in omnibus Deus; quia pater manet in filio." Hec est pie subiectonis interpretatio. Item alibi: "Quod si queris quemadmodum sit subiectus in nobis, ipse ostendit dicens: In carcere eram et venistis ad me. Infirmitus eram et visitastis me. Qued uni ex minimis meis fecistis, mihi fecistis."⁹ In eo infirmus, (78) in quo subiectus. Item, lege Hilarius de hac subiectione mirifice¹⁰ disserentem et gloriosam potius quam inuriosam illam esse demonstrantem. Dicit enim inter cetera, libro XI:¹¹ "Subiectis omnibus ei, praeter eum qui subiecit ei omnia. Tunc subiectur ipse subicienti sibi omnia. Subiectonis vero causa non alia quam ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus. Finis itaque est, esse Deum omnia in omnibus. Et querendum nunc ante omnia est, an finis defectio sit, an traditio, qua dat regnum patri, amissio sit an subiectio infirmitas sit." Et post pauca:¹² "Quo autem subiectonis illius proprietas sit idem apostolus testatus est, cum ait: Qui transfigurabit corpus humilitatis nostre conforme corpori glorie sue, secundum efficacie sue opera, qua possit sibi subicere omnia.¹³ Subiectio itaque etiam ea est, que est ex natura in naturam concessio, dum a se secundum quod est desinens, ei subicitur, cuius concedit in formam. Desinit autem, non ut non sit, sed ut proficiat. Fiat ex diminutione subitus, in speciem subcepit alteris generis transeundo. Denique ut sacramenti huius esset, ratio absoluta, post novissime devictam morten, dum ait: Cum autem dixerit omnia (79) subiecta absque eo, qui subiecit ei omnia, tunc et ipse filius subiectus erit illi qui ei subiecit omnia ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus. Primus igitur sacramenti gradus est, subiecta esse ei omnia, et tunc ipsum subiectum fieri subicienti sibi omnia, ut quemadmodum nos glorie regnantis corporis sui subdimur eodem rursum sacramento ipse regnans in gloria corporis subicienti sibi universa subdatur." Et post pauca:¹⁴ "Regnat autem in hoc eodem gloriose iam sue corpore donec evacuatis magistratibus et morte devicta subiciat sibi inimicos. Et quidem ab apostolo servatus hic modus est ut magistratibus et potestatibus evacuatio,¹⁵ inimicis vero, subiectio deputaretur. Quibus subiectis subiectur subicienti sibi omnia in omnibus Deo scilicet ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus nature assumpti corporis nostri natura paterne divinitatis invecta. Per

¹ Ambrosius, *De Fide*, Book V, par. 179.¹¹ Hilarius, Book XI, par. 26-7. MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. X, col. 417.² Eph. 2:6.¹² Hilarius, Book XI, par. 35. MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. X, col. 422.³ St. AMBROSE, *De Fide*, Book V, par. 181-3.¹³ Phil. 3:21.⁴ Eph. 2:5.¹⁴ Hilarius, Book XI, par. 40; MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. X, col. 425.⁵ Eph. 5:23.¹⁵ MS. *Evacutio*.⁶ Gal. 3:13.⁷ Phil. 2:8.⁸ Phil. 2:10.⁹ Matt. 25:36 ff.; St. Ambrose, *De Fide*, Book V, par. 178.¹⁰ MS. *mififico*.

hoc enim erit omnia in omnibus Deus quia secundum dispensationem ex Deo et homine, hominum Deique mediator, habens in se ex dispensatione quod carnis est adepturus in omnibus ex subiectione quod Dei est ne ex parte Deus sit sed Deus totus. Non alia itaque subiectionis causa est quam ut omnia in omnibus Deus sit, nulla ex parte terreni (80) in eo corporis residente natura, ut ante in se duo continens nunc Deus tantum sit, non abieci corpore sed ex subiectione translato neque per defec-tionem abolito, sed ex clarificatione mutato acquirens sibi Deo potius hominem quam Deum per hominem amittens, ut sit Deus omnia in omnibus per quod non divinitatis infirmitas est sed assumptionis proiectus dum homo et Deus iam Deus totum est.

XVII. HYLARIUS CONTRA SENSUM IUDAICUM

Contra sensum quoque Iudaice inpietatis idem libro VIII loquitur.¹ Tulerunt igitur lapides Iudei ut lapidarent eum. Respondens multa bona opera ostendi robis a patre. Propter quod eorum opus lapidatis me? Responderunt ei Iudei, pro bono opere non lapidamus te sed pro blasphemia et quia tu cum sis homo facis te Deum.² “At tu vero heretice quid agas ac profitearis agnosce. Et eorum te intellige esse consortem, quorum mente refers perfidie exemplum. Ad id enim quod dictum est [Ego]³ et pater unum sumus, Iudei lapides elevaverunt et eorum impius dolor jad sacramentum fidei a salutaris inpatiens usque ad impetum inferende mortis erupit. Quid tu? Non habendo quem lapides negande minus efficis? Non differt (81) voluntas sed voluntatem tuam inefficacem celestis tronus efficit. Quantum irreligiosior Iudeo! Lepides ille in corpus elevat, tu in spiritum. Ille in hominem, ut putabat, tu in Deum. Ille in diversantem in terris, tu in sedentem in trono virtutis. Ille in ignoratum, tu in confessum. Ille in moriturum, tu in iudicem seculorum. Ille dicit: *Tu cum sis homo, tu dicas, cum sis creatura.* Uterque dicitis: *Facis te Deum.* Hoc commune in eum impii vestri oris obproprium est. Negas enim Deum ex generatione Dei. Negas filium ex nativitatis veritate. Negas, *Ego et pater unum sumus*, confessionem unius in utroque atque consimilis esse nature. Subicis substantie nove et externe et aliene Deum ut aut alterius generis Deus sit, aut omnino nec Deus sit, quia non ex Dei nativitate subsistat, sed quia ad sacramentum dicti huius communotus es, Ego et pater unum sumus, et Iudeo dicente: *Tu, cum sis homo, facis te Deum,* tu pari inpietate dicas: *Cum sis creatura facis te Deum.* Dicis enim: *Non es filius ex nativitate, non es Deus ex veritate.* Creatura es praestantior cunctis, sed non es in Deum natus, ex incorporali Deo nativitatem non admitto (82) nature. Non modo tu et pater non unum estis, sed nec filius es, nec similis es, nec Deus es. Iudeis quidem Dominus respondit, sed magis ad inpietatem tuam omnis hec apta responsio est: *Noune scriptum est in lege quoniam ego dixi Dii estis?*⁴ Si ergo dixit illos Deos, ad quos verbum factum est Dei, et non potest solvi scriptura, quem pater sanctificavit et misit in hunc mundum vos dicitis quia blasphemavi quoniam dixi filius Dei sum. *Si non facio opera patris mei, nolite mihi credere.* Si autem facio et si mihi non vultis credere, operibus credite ut sciatis et cognoscatis quoniam pater in me est et ego in eo.⁵ Causam responsonis causa obiecte ei blasphemie intulit. Id enim ad crimen deputabatur quod se, cum homo esset, Deum faceret. Deum autem se facere per id arguebatur quod dixisset: Ego et pater unum sumus. Demonstratur itaque hoc, quod ipse et pater unum essent, ex nativitatis usurpatum esse natura, in eo primum ineptiam ridiculi obprobrii computat, cur in reatum vocaretur quod se, cum homo esset, Deum faceret. Cum enim lex huius nominis appellationem (83) sanctis hominibus decerneret et sermo Dei indissolubilis confirmaret hanc impertiri in homines professionem, quomodo hic quem pater sanctificasset et in hunc mundum misisset blasphemus esset se Dei filium confitendo, cum cognominatos Deos per legem Deos indissolubilis Dei sermo statuisset? Iam ergo non est criminis quod se Deum, cum homo sit, faciat, cum eos, qui homines sint, lex Deos dixerit. Et a certis hominibus non irreligiosa huius nominis est usurpatio. Est ab eo homine quem sanctificavit pater? Omnis enim hic de homine responsio est, quia Dei filius etiam nominis filius est. Idem, in undecimo: Id enim homini acquirebatur ut Deus

¹ Cf. HILARIUS, Book VIII, par. 43.

² John 10:32.

³ MS. omiss.

⁴ Ps. 81:6.

⁵ John 10:38.

esset, sed manere in Dei unitate assumptus nullomodo poterat nisi per unitatem Dei in unitatem Dei naturalis evaderet ut per hoc, quod in natura erat Deus verbum, verbum quoque caro factum rursum in natura Dei esset, atque ita homo Jesus Christus maneret in gloria Dei patris, si in gloria verbi caro esset unita, rediretque tunc in natura paterne etiam secundum hominem unitatem, verbum caro factum cum gloriam verbi caro assumpta tenuisset. Reddenda igitur apud se ipsum patri erat unitas sua ut nativitas nature sue in se rursum glorificanda (81) resideret, quia dispensati novitas offensionem unitatis intulerat et unitas, ut perfecta fuerat, nulla esse nunc poterat nisi glorificata apud se fuisse carnis assumptio. Item, donatur Iesu ut *ei, celestia, terrestria, et inferna genu flecant et omnis lingua confiteatur*¹ quoniam *Dominus Jesus Christus* in gloria Dei patris sit confitendus. Audis itaque, *Pater maior me est.* Seito eum de quo ob meritum obedientie, dictum est, *Et donavit ei nomen quod est super omne nomen.* Audis rursum: *Ego et pater unum sumus et qui me videt videt et patrem, et ego in patre et pater in me est.*² Honorem donate confessionis intellige, quia Dominus Jesus in gloria est Dei patris. Quando igitur illud est *pater maior me est?* Nempe eum donavit ei nomen quod est super omne nomen. At contra, quando est *Ego et pater unum sumus?* Nempe cum omnis lingua confitetur quia Dominus Jesus est in gloria Dei patris. Si igitur donantis auctoritate pater maior me est numquid per doni confessionem minor filius est? Maior utique donans est, sed minor iam non est cui unum esse donatur. Si non hoc donatur Iesu ut confitendus sit in gloria Dei patris minor patre. Si autem in ea gloria donatur ei esse, (85) qua pater est, habes et in donantis auctoritate, quia maior est, et in donati confessione quia unum sit. Maior itaque pater est filio et plane maior, cui tantum donat esse quantus ipse est in nascibilitatis imaginem, sacramento nativitatis impertit ei, quem ex se in forma sua generat, quem rursum de forma servi in formam Dei renovat, quem in gloria sua secundum spiritum Christum Deum natum donat rursum esse in gloria sua secundum carnem Iesum Christum Deum natum. Idem, in epistola de synodis: *Conservatur dignitas divinitatis ut in eo quod verbum caro factum est, dum verbum caro sit, non amiserit per carnem quod erat verbum neque translatum in carnem sit, ut verbum esse desineret, sed verbum caro factum est, ut potius caro hoc inciperet esse quod verbum.* Alioquin unde carni in operibus virtutes, in monte gloriam, in cognitionibus humanorum cordium scientiam, in passione securitatem, in morte vitam?

XIX. DE SCALA IACOB

Hee et similia patrum catholicorum sensa congerendo videor mihi videre angelos descendentes et ascendentibus super filium hominis in scala que demonstrata est Iacob dormienti.³ Annon ascendunt eum (86) sublimia de gloria Christi praedicant ut est illud, *ego et pater unum sumus, quod tam de humane quam divine substantie in Christo gloria verbis Hylarii supra exposuimus?* Item, eum adtenditur Christus ante passionem dixisse: *Si diligeretis me gauderetis utique quia ad patrem vado, quia pater maior me est,* angeli hec praedicantes descendant, post passionem vero cum dicit Christus, *Data est mihi omnis potestas in celo et in terra,*⁴ que vox est hominis assumpti, cui data est omnis potestas verbi sibi uniti, ascensiones in corde ista meditantes disponunt. Descendit Athanasius cum dixit “*minor patre* secundum humanitatem,” ascendit eum dixit “*sedet ad dexteram Dei patris omnipotentis.*” Que utraque sunt de natura humana, cuius in priore sententia per nomen humanitatis exprimitur nuda conditio, que non est maior in Christo quam in Petro, nec maior in Petro salvato quam in Iuda perditio, in secunda vero eiusdem humanitatis exaltatio et glorificatio, descendente videlicet atque ascidente hoc angelo super filium hominis, qui et minor est patre secundum *pure* humanitatis conditionem et equalis, (87) immo unum eum ipso secundum eiusdem sue humanitatis in divine potestatis altera evectionem.

Sic enim premissa patrum verba testantur homini assumpto datum est esse in gloria

¹ Rom. 11:11.² John 10:30.³ Gen. 28:12.⁴ John 11:28.⁵ Matt. 28:18.

patris ita, ut hoc omnis lingua confiteatur, quamquam Iudei et iudaizantes heretici valenter literati hoc negare audeant, quorum quidam dietis et scriptis hoc docent, quod Christus in natura humana Dei filius non sit nisi per adoptionem, cum longe ante nos hie error sit condempnatus in Bonoso¹ heretico et meo quoque tempore, eum essem Rome,² ab Honorio³ papa fuerit exsufflata hec perversa doctrina porrecto ei libello a quoddam canonico Lateranensi hoc rationaliter asserente, quod etiam secundum hominem Christus est filius Dei naturalis, non adoptivus. Hinc ei illud privilegium quod patrem suum dicit Deum, verbi gratia, *Pater meus usquemodo operatur et ego operor*, et alibi, *ascendo ad patrem meum et patrem vestrum* se videlicet naturalem filium secernens ab adoptivis quorum nulli congruit dicere pater meus pro nomine singulari sed pater noster communiter habent onnes dicere quos et filius naturalis in fratres et pater in filios dignatur adoperare. Profecto istum sensum non quidem dilexerunt (88) sed tamen intellexerunt Iudei cum Christo nominante Deum patrem suum, indicaverunt eum blasphemum, quod de communi paternitate minime sensissent, quoniam et ipsi habebant hoc usitatum ut dicerent, *Unum patrem habemus, Deum*.⁴ Si quidem ista paternitas gratie non coequat filios patri omnipotenti, ut illa singularis et naturalis, in qua dicit filius unigenitus: *Omnia mihi tradita sunt a patre meo*: item: *Pater meus quod dedit mihi maius est omnibus*. Alias autem ubi se fratribus consociat sub paternitate gracie humilia filiisque adoptivis convenientia de se loquitur ut illue: *Sed ut cognoseat mundus quia diligo patrem et sicut mandatum dedit mihi pater sic facio*.⁵ Non hie dicit patrem meum vel pater meus, neque communiter dicit pater noster, sed absolute pater; ut intelligas hoc nomine paternitate[m] totius divinitatis homini assumpto mandata dictantis quid faciat, quid inducit. Unde ait: *Non possum ego a me ipso facere quicquam sed sicut audio, iudico*.⁶ Apostolus quoque hanc paternitatem notat ubi ait: *Unus Deus et pater omnium qui super omnes et per omnia et in omnibus nobis*.⁷ Et nos eum dieimus pater noster qui es in celis,⁸ totam invocamus trinitatem nomine (89) patris, cuius gratia datur nobis ut filii Dei roemur⁹ et simus qui natura eramus filii ire,¹⁰ sed is qui numquam erat filius ire, solus dignus fuit audire a patre: *Tu es filius meus dilectus in te mihi complacui*.¹¹ Item in Psalmo: *Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te*.¹² Ac si dicat: Alios mihi alienos regenerabo in filios adoptivos, te ab eterno praedestinatum filium meum in virtute genui mihi filium naturale, qui solus invocabis me dicendo *Pater meus es tu, et ego primogenitum ponam te*.¹³ Magna dignitas huius primogeniti, qui et in divinitate sua primogenitus est omnis creature atque in humanitate sua primogenitus mortuorum ut, sicut apostolus ait, Sit in omnibus ipse primatum, tenens tam in humanitate sua cui data est omnis potestas in celo et in terra, quam in divinitate sua cuius potestas est eterna.

XIX. DE EO QUOD DICIT FILIUS: NON POSSUM A ME IPSO FACERE QUICQUAM.

Neque vero movere debet quod dicit: *Non possum a me ipso facere quicquam, sed sicut audio iudico*;¹⁴ quasi per hec dicta notetur assumpti hominis in potentia, eum nec verbum Dei Deus possit a se ipso facere quicquam, quia nec a se ipso est, sed a patre suo et est et potest, atque sine illo nichil potest; quod tamen non est inpotentia (90) sed magna potentia, vel potius omnipotentia, sicut ex opposito angelum vel hominem posse aliquid a semetipso magna est infirmitas et inpotentia. Quid est enim facere hominem aliquid a semetipso nisi peccare? Sicut enim cum quis loquitur mendacium, ex propriis loquitur; maxime si ita est mendax ut pater

¹ Bonosus, bishop of Sardica. Cf. ST. AMBROSE'S *Letters to the Synod of Capua*, Anno 391; MANSI, Vol. III, pp. 683-86; MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. XVI, cols. 1222 ff.; HEFELE, Vol. II, 2d ed., pp. 53, 300.

² Probably 1126.

³ Honorius II, 1124-30. Gerhoh went to Rome as the messenger of Conrad, archbishop of Salzburg, to beg the aid of the pope in his struggle against the secular clergy. Cf. MIGNE, Vol. CXCVI, col. 1377, also Vol. CXCVII, col. 1377; *Libelli*, Vol. III, p. 204.

⁴ John 8:41.

⁶ John 5:30.

⁸ Matt. 6:9.

¹⁰ Eph. 2:3.

¹¹ Matt. 3:17; 2 Peter 1:17; Mark 1:11; Luke 3:22.

¹² Ps. 2:7; Acts 13:33; Heb. 1:5, 5:5.

¹³ Ps. 88:27.

⁵ John 14:38.

⁷ Eph. 4:6.

⁹ John 3:1.

quoque et inventor sit eius mendatii quod loquitur; sicut diabolus, ita etiam cum quis peccat, ex propriis et a semetipso facit quod facit. Cum ergo dicitur: Non potest filius a semetipso facere quicquam nisi quod viderit patrem facientem, vel non possum ego a me ipso facere quicquam, verba hec sonant non inpotentiam sed omnipotentiam, quod ex adiunctis intelligi potest cum dicitur: Quecunque enim ille facit hec et filius similiter facit. Quis mihi tribuat spoliari hac potentia qua possim a me ipso facere aliquid, sicut primus homo de terra terrenus a semetipso fecit quod ei serpens per mulierem suggestis? Contingat mihi hac potentia privari et perfecte incorporari homini de celo celesti, qui non potest a semetipso facere quicquam, licet habens cum patre suo eternam potentiam et virtutem invictissimam et gloriam magnam, quia quod dedit illi pater maius est omnibus. Dicta hec exponens venerabilis (91) Beda presbyter ait: *Maius autem omnibus, quod mediatori Dei et hominum Iesu Christo pater dedit, hoc est, ut sit unigenitus filius eius in ulla gignenti vel natura dissimilis vel virtute inferior, vel tempore posterior.* Quam videlicet equalitatem ipse Dominus in divinitate habuit priusquam mundus esset apud patrem, ipse in humanitate ex tempore incarnationis accepit. Maximus episcopus de natale Domini tractans, ipsam nativitatem, qua Deus natus est ex femina, divinam potius quam humanam nominandam censuit, dicens inter cetera: Secreto quodam incomprehensoque conceptu procedit de mortali femina divina progenies. Nec mirum sane si extitit divina nativitas ubi non erat humana conceptio. Idem: *Duas in Christo generationes legimus sed in utraque incomprehense dirinitatis est virtus, ibi enim illum ex semetipso genuit Deus, hic eum virgo, Deo operante, concepit, illa nativitate hominem fecit, hac generatione hominem liberavit.* Cum autem duas Christi legimus nativitates non bis asseritur Dei filius natus sed gemina in uno Dei filio confirmatur esse substantia. Idem: *Igitur Deus qui apud Deum erat prodirit a Deo et caro Dei que in Deo non erat processit ex femina.* Item, *Verbum caro factum est non ut Deus evanesceretur (92) in hominem sed ut homo glorificaretur in Deum.* Ita nobis notus est Deus sed ex duabus nativitatibus, id est, *Dei et hominis, se ipsum unigenitus patris atque in sese hominem unum esse voluit Deum.* Generationem eius quis enarrabit?² Idem in eodem: *Quomodo comprehendere potest homo Deum factus ingenitum, mortalis eternum?* Si investigare niteris qualiter Deus in hominem vel homo transiit in Deum, investiga prius, si potes, quomodo ex nichilo factus est mundus. Quid contra hec dicere habent qui humanam in Christo naturam a divina virtute sic alienam fingunt ut assumpta in personam vel proprietatem persone, que Deus non sit, nomen quod est super omne nomen, habere non possit, nisi, ut dicunt, in persona? Et utinam sic ista dicent ut personam ipsam filii Dei, cuius in unitatem assumptus est homo, concederent esse Deum et divinam substantiam.

XX. QUOD FILII PERSONA DIVINA SUBSTANTIA SIT

Non, inquiunt, possumus concedere quod proprietates in Deo quibus Deus non aliquid est, sicut divinitate Deus, bonitate bonus, magnitudine magnus, vel ut ait Boetius, ipsum bonus, ipsum magnus est, sed potius ad aliquid dicitur, ut pater non ad se, sed ad filium, et filius ad patrem. Non, inquiunt, concedimus huiuscemodi proprietates forin-(93)secus affixas inter substantialia vel inherentia computari neque in divina certe neque in humana substantia. Tibi enim existenti in Arabia si filius nascatur in Hibernia que circa te queso ob hoc accidit permutacio? Ad hec respondemus quod qui hec de dictis, ut aiunt, Boetii ac magistri Gilliberti Boetium glosantis conceperunt, hoc pariter ibidem notasse debuerunt quod auctor dicit: *In naturalibus rationabiliter, in mathematicis disciplinaliter, in divinis intellectualiter, versari oportebit, nec deduci ad imagines sed ipsam inspicere formam, que vere forma et imago est, et que ipsum esse est et ex qua esse est.* Cum ergo prohibeat auctoritas in divinis mathematicae versandum, quare tu mathematica consideratione abstractim consideras vel proprietates personarum quasi extrinsecus affixas, que ipse persone non sint, ut in humanis personis promptum est

¹ ST. AUGUSTINE, Sermo XIII, in Natali Domini, I.² Isa. 53:8; Acts 8:33.

animadverti vel personas ipsas quasi extra substantiam, quod neque in humanis neque in divinis personis reperire poteris? Omnis enim persona humana est humana substantia et omnis persona divina divina utique substantia est. Nam et pater, quod est nomen persone, tam in divinis quam in humanis, nominat et nominando significat (94) substantiam cum proprietate relationis homini quidem formsecus, ut dicitur, affixe, ut, verbi gratia, patriarche Abrahe paternitatis relatio ad Ysaac filium suum extra se positum pluribus accidentibus a se discretum. Que si omnia mathematica distinzione secernas locum tamen quo alter ab altero distat unum fingere non poteris. Alter vero est in Deo. Nam et ibi pater substantiam cum proprietate nominat et nominando significat, sed eandem proprietatem sensu mathematico a Deo distingue sicut in homine, alienum est a fide catholica, qua credimus unum Deum in trinitate venerandum, ita utque in trinitate persona sit plenus Deus et divina substantia. Unde in trinitate una persona incarnata, credimus eiusdem persone substantiam incarnatam, sicut magnus Basilius totam divinitatem in sua persona incarnatam testatur in libro *De Dispensatione*, dicens: *Sicut confitemur deitatis naturam omnem perfecte esse in unaquaque ipsius personarum, omnem quidem in patre, omnem in filio, omnem in spiritu sancto, unde et perfectus Deus pater, perfectus Deus et filius, perfectus Deus et spiritus sanctus. Sic etiam et inhumanationem unius persone sancte trinitatis, Dei verbi, dicimus omnem et perfectam naturam* (95) *deitatis in una ipsius persona unitam esse omni humane nature et non partem parti. Dicit autem divinus apostolus, quoniam in ipso habitat omnis plenitudo deitatis in corpore Domini, id est, in carne ipsius; et huius disceipulis mutum divina intuitus (vel indutus),¹ Dionisius, quibus omnino nobis in una ipsius communicavit personarum. Non autem dicere cogimur omnes deitatis personas videlicet nobis secundum personam uniri. Secundum nullam enim communicavit rationem pater et spiritus sanctus incarnationi verbi Dei nisi secundum beneficium et voluntatem. Omni enim humane nature dicimus unitam esse omnem deitatis substantiam. Nichil enim eorum que in nostra a principio plantarit natura nos componens reliquit. Sed omnia accepit corpus, animam intellectivam et rationalem, et horum propria. Animal enim sine unius horum parte non homo est. Totus enim totum assumpsit, et totus toti unitus est ut toti salutem largiatur.* Idem post aliqua: *Eadem natura in unaquaque personarum consideratur et eum dicamus naturam verbi incarnatam esse secundum beatos Athanasium et Cirillum deitatem dicimus unitam esse carni. Quare naturam verbi dicentes ipsum verbum significamus. Verbum autem et communitatem substantie et pro-(96)prietatem persone possidet. Item, post pauca: Sciendum autem quod quamvis ingredi invicem Domini naturas dicamus. Sed enim scimus quod ex divina ingressus factus est, hec enim omnia penetrat, sicut vult et circumserbit, per ipsam autem nichil. Et hec autem propria carni assignat permanens ipsa passibilis. Hec propter eos inducta sint qui sic putant personam filii Dei incarnatam, ut naturalam persone autument ab incarnatione alienam. Quorum sensum vel potius insanum non satis mirari possumus cum nomina hec, pater, filius, et spiritus sanctus, personarum praesentativa denegare non possint etiam substantiam significare. Neque enim vacua sunt nomina, sed unum quodque illorum significat substantiam cum proprietate sua, quod significatum Greci ypostasin (*ὑποτασσων*) id est, subsistentiam, Latini, personam vocant. Ideoque cum ex tribus personis vel subsistentiis una incarnata conditur nullomodo substantia eius debet credi ab incarnatione alienata. Nam cum verbum, ut Basilius ait, et communitatem substantie et proprietatem persone possideat, verbo incarnato, substantia verbi non potest non esse incarnata. Et hoc est quod Leo Papa dicit veram divinitatem veris nature humanae (97) sensibus indutam, et quod Gregorius dicit divinitatem calciatam, et Boetius dicit humanitatem naturali unitate divinitati coniunctam. Bene utique naturali, quoniam natura hominis ita est condita ut esset capax divine sapientie, que verbum Dei est. Que cum se multis hominum personis participandam indulserit, quos et sui participatione prophetas et sapientes fecit, solum sibi unitum hominem sic implevit ut non*

¹ Added in the margin.

tam reete sapiens quam ipsa Dei sapientia dici possit, praedicante apostolo, *Christum Dei virtutem et Dei sapientiam.*¹ Dicis itaque mihi: Si verbi divinitas incarnata est, patris autem atque verbi ac spiritus sancti una est divinitas, quomodo, verbi divinitate incarnata, pater non est incarnatus ac spiritus sanctus? Respondeo tibi quia quomodo illud sit non est huius temporis scire, credere autem necessarium. Credenti autem non erit impossibile omne verbum, *quia omnia possibilia credenti.*² Et plures quidem plura inducunt ad unius essentiae in tribus personis demonstrationem, verbi gratia, unius anime mentem, noticiam, amorem, vel unius mentis memoriam, intelligentiam, voluntatem, vel unius radii calorem, et splendorem, vel (98) unius arboris radicem, truncum, et ramum, vel unius aquae fontem, rivum, et stagnum. Sed nos de omnibus huiusmodi similitudinibus id magis eligimus quod intellectum dat parvulis. Quis enim vel parvolorum non intelligat quod unius aquae fons, rivos, et lacus tria hec omnino substantie sunt unius ac nature? Denique si talem fontem cogites, qui de sese rivum emittat, ita ut rivus in lacum se colligat, laeisque ipse venas fontis contingat, iuxta quod omnia flumina redeunt ad fontem suum ut iterum fluant. Nonne aqua ista in fonte, rivo, ac lacu, est una et eadem quamquam illa tria de se invicem praedicari non possint, ita ut dicatur fons esse rivos, aut rivos lacus? Adde quod, rivo infistulato, in solo rivo tota substantia illius aquae infistulata cernitur, et tamen neque fons neque lacus vere dici potest infistulatus, cum tota eorum substantia in solo rivo sit infistulata. Item, Ex uno radio splendor et calor procedit nec ab illo recedit. Suntque tria hec, radius, splendor, et calor, licet suis proprietatibus distincta, tamen localiter indivisa, et splendor solus inter hec tria suscepit illuminacionem, sicut calor solus desiccationem. Verum quia in similitudinibus huiusmodi a creaturis ad creatorem accomodans, non licet usque ad imaginationes mutabilium descendere contemplantem vel disputantem, illuc per ista mutabilia mens est elevanda ubi non in unius singularitate persone sed in unius trinitate substantie sic tres unum sunt, ut unitas qua unum sunt ipsi sint quemadmodum ipsa divinitas, qua Deus sunt, et ipsa veritas et bonitas, qua verum bonum sunt, ipsi sunt.

XXI. CONFUTATIO PRAVE DOCTRINE

Miror autem cum auctoritas habeat patrem esse veritatem, filium esse veritatem, spiritum sanctum esse veritatem, patrem, filium, et spiritum sanctum non tres veritates sed unam esse veritatem, quare magister Gillibertus talem glosam posuerit ut diceret in Boetium: Pater veritas, id est, verus est. Item, filius veritas, id est, verus est. Item, spiritus sanctus veritas, id est, verus est. Et collectim, pater, filius, spiritus sanctus non sunt tres veritates sed sunt una singulariter et simpliciter et simpliciter veritas, id est, unus verus. Qualem putamus expositio hec sensum importat nisi ut nec pater intelligatur esse ipsa veritas, sed veritate verus? Item, filius non veritas, sed veritate verus, et item de spiritu sancto et de tota trinitate id ipsum astruit, quod Deus trinus non sit una veritas, sed, sicut ipse ait, unus verus veritate, quem secundum eius doctrinam nec pater nec filius nec spiritus sanctus nec trinitas (100) sit nec Deus sit, quomodo in alio loco divinitatem introducit, qua Deus sit non que Deus sit, ita enim dicit: Qui est homo, ut Plato, vel Cicerio, vel Tripho, vel qui est Deus, ut pater, vel filius, vel spiritus sanctus, quod dicitur illorum quilibet esse homo, et istorum quilibet esse Deus, refertur ad substantiam non que est, sed qua est. Auctoris autem verba sic se habent. Qui homo est vel Deus, refertur ad substantiam, qua est aliquid, id est, homo vel Deus. Planiora fateor verba sunt auctoris quam expositoris, quoniam auctor eum, qui homo est, verbi gratia, Petrum vel Paulum, per hominis vocabulum substantivum substantiam significat humanam esse, et item illum qui Deus est, verbi gratia, pater, aut filius, aut spiritus sanctus, per Dei nomen substantivum substantiam divinam significat esse. Ac proinde quia substantia, tam divina per nomen Dei, quam humana per nomen hominis, de pluribus vera et naturali connexione praedicatur, sicut nec humanam ita nec divinam substantiam dicit auctor alicubi singularem, cum iste novus expositor seu transpositor divinam

¹ 1 Cor. 1:24.

² Mark 9:22.

substantiam creberiū dicat singularem contra synodalem diffinitionem, qua, ut Hylarius com-memorat in synodis orientalibus et singularitas est reprobata contra Sabellium et Fotinum, et substantia vel equalitas ac similitudo naturalis inter patrem et filium est recepta contra Eunomium et Arrium, (101) ita ut essentia deitatis nec singularis diceretur nec diversa, quoniam singularis non est, que trium est, nec diversa que unitas ipsorum trium est, nec differens in se, quamquam de tribus alteritate relationis differentibus, ipse praedicetur magis et rectius per nomina essentialia quam per nomina sumpta. Magis enim proprie dicitur pater ac filius ac spiritus sanctus atque totus trinus Deus esse bonitas, veritas, iusticia quam bonus, verus, iustus, et similia, que omnia sunt in Deo una simplex, non tamen singularis, essentia. Si enim singularis esset ipsorum trium veritas, cum veritas de terra orta sit, quam intelligimus ipsum Dei filium de Maria natum, consequeretur id quod Sabellius voluit, patrem videlicet esse incarnatum et passum, filio eius, qui veritas est, incarnato et passo. Sed hoc secernit patrem veritatem ab incarnatione veritatis genite, quod ipse pater est veritas a nullo, filius autem est veritas de veritate, sicut est lumen de lumine, Deus de Deo, sapientia de sapientia, iusticia de iusticia. Unde recte patris imago dicitur et figura substantie eius in ipsius patris, scilicet, expressa substantia, tanquam si regis imago in auro expressa dicatur aurea substantia. Figura, inquit, substantie eius ne personam filii non substantiam intelligas, aut etiam proprietatem ipsius persone putas extra substantiam separatim intelligendam, aut forinsecus affixam, cum (102) sit in patre totus filius et totus in verbo pater. Non sic se habet relatio similis ad similem, equalis ad equalem, patris ad filium, atque ut auctor ait, eiusdem ad idem, licet non eiusdem ad eundem in creatrice trinitate sicut in rebus creatis, quia cognata rebus caducis alteritas bene admittit quorundam praedicamentorum inherentias et forinsecas affixiones, ut auctor assignat, que omnia vera theologia procul a Deo removet, docens eum, ut ait Augustinus, sine qualitate bonum, sine quantitate magnum, sine indigentia creatorem, sine situ praesentem, sine habitu omnia continentem, sine loco ubique, totum sine tempore sempiternum, sine ulla sui mutatione mutabilia facientem, nichil patientem. Quisquis Deum ita cogitat et non dum potest omnino invenire quid sit, pie tamen cavit, quantum potest, aliquid de illo sentire quod non sit. Et tamen sine dubio substantia, vel si melius hoc appellatur essentia, quam Greci usyam vocant, hec usya sive substantia divinitatis minime susceptibilis est contrariorum sive ullorum accidentium quoniam relationes que insunt ei non sunt accidentales, proprietates, quia pater Deus, sicut numquam fuit non Deus, ita numquam fuit non pater, et filius Deus, sicut numquam non Deus, ita numquam fuit non filius, et amborum connexio, sicut numquam fuit non connexio, praecedens ab utroque nec recedens. Unde (103) patri Deo non accidentale, aut sicut aiunt, forinsecus est affixum esse patrem, vel filio Deo esse filium, sed omnino patri eterno naturale est naturalem filium habere, similiterque filio eterno est naturale naturalem patrem habere, et illis ambobus naturale est invicem diligere se non extrinseca vel, ut aiunt, extrinsecus affixa dilectione, sed ea que Deus est, que divina substantia est, que tercia in trinitate persona est, et unius cum reliquis duabus usye, vel potius cum eis una usya est, quoniam sicut auctoritas habet, relatio multiplicat trinitatem, substantia conservat unitatem. Hec substantia divina de singulis personis divinis praedicatur, quomodo humana substantia de singulis, personis humanis. Et enim sicut Petrus vel Paulus est homo et humana substantia, ita pater Dei, seu filius Dei, Deus est et divina substantia, atque ideo, filio Dei incarnato, recte credimus divinam substantiam incarnatam, non tamen incarnato patre, qui nichilominus est divina substantia. Quomodo, inquis, potuerunt hec fieri? Et ego dieo tibi: *Tu es magister in Frantia et hec ignoras?*¹ Si terrena exempla de unius aque fonte, rivo, et laco proposui vobis et non intelligitis, quomodo si dixerim vobis celestia credetis? Annon intelligitis, rivo infistulato, in ipso substantiam fontis et laci esse infistulatam, nec tamen fontem esse infistulatum seu lacum; amplius autem si naturam (104) verbi verbum dicit Basilius, doctor catholicus, ut supra ostendimus, quomodo non similiter naturam patris patrem nominabimus? Atque ita secundum hunc sensum catholicum nichil est aliud dicere

¹ John 3:10.

substantiam seu divinitatem filii esse incarnatam, quam ipsum filium, qui substantia divina et ipsa divinitas est, esse incarnatum, neque tamen inde consequitur patrem, qui similiter substantia divina et ipsa divinitas est, esse incarnatum in sua persona, cuius tamen substantia in filio suo est incarnata. Si enim Dei filius iam totus impassibilis est licet in sue nature humane consortibus fratribus esuriem, aut famem, sitim, nuditatem, exilium, carcerem, et infirmitatem se pati contestetur, quia natura videlicet in ipsum assumpta in suis hec patitur, ipso tamen in sue inpassibilitatis gloria permanente, quid mirum quod Deus pater semper impassibilis creditur permansisse ac permanere, cuius tamen filius naturalis nature videlicet paterne consors *exinanivit se ipsum, formam servi accepens*,¹ et in ea mortem crucis perferens, patris tamen et sua divinitate in sue inpassibilitatis gloria permanente ac implete carnem, que in ipso Dei filio passa est? Sic dicit Augustinus: “*Implevit carnem Christi pater* (105) *et spiritus sanctus, sed maiestate, non susceptione.*”

XXII. QUOMODO PATER ET SPIRITUS SANCTUS IMPLESSE² CARNEM CHRISTI SIT CRENDUS

Quidam in his dictis Augustini non aliud intelligunt nomine maiestatis carnem Christi impletis quam tunc intel[li]gitur cum omnis creatura maiestate Dei plena praedicatur, ipso Deo dicente, *Celum et terram ego imleo.*³ Item, canit ecclesia: *Pteni sunt celi et terra gloria tua.* Sed hic sensus ex if[li]lis est ad magnificandum illud singulare sacramentum dominice incarnationis, in quo Maria exultans dicit: *Magnificat anima mea Dominum.*⁴ Ergo, ut estimo, altius est intelligendum quod pater et spiritus sanctus dicuntur maiestate sua implevisse vel implere hominem illum qui dicit, *Pater in me manens ipse facit opera*,⁵ *qui in digito Dei*, quem spiritum sanctum intelligimus, *eicit demonia.*⁶ Si enim non aliter implevit patris ac spiritus sancti maiestas carnem Christi quam implet lapidem vel nos omnes, qui dicere possumus: *In ipso vivimus, moveamur, et sumus,*⁷ quid attinuit super tali plenitudine admirari evangelistam dicentem: *Vidimus gloriam eius gloria quasi unigeniti a patre, plenum gratia et veritate.*⁸ Item, alius evangelista plenum spiritu sancto illum commemorat, quando regressus est ab Iordanis in Galileam⁹ post baptismum, ubi et columba super ipsum conspecta hoc indicavit (106) quod tota plenitudo sancti spiritus perpetuo in ipso esset mansura, sicut Iohanni praedictum fuerat: *Super quem videris spiritum descendenter et manentem super eum, hic est qui baptizat in spiritu sancto*¹⁰ Homo igitur bona opera faciens, quo operante, operatur simul et pater et quem videns quis, videt et patrem, quiq[ue] baptizat in spiritu sancto,¹¹ longe aliter impletus est maiestate patris et spiritus sancti quam vel sancti angeli et homines beati vel etiam tota creatura.

XXIII. DE VOCE PATRIS AD FILIUM ET DE SPECIE COLUMBE

Quid dicemus de voce patris audita cum videretur sanctus spiritus in specie columbe super hominem verbo ipsius patris unitum? Nonne tibi hec adtendenti omnis plenitudo divinitatis in homine assumpto inhabitantis manifestat semetipsam in patris voce, in filii corpore, in sancti spiritus columbina specie? *Tu es*, inquit, *filius meus dilectus in quo mihi complacui.*¹² Hoc ut iam supra commemoravimus, ab initio non dixit cum universa conderet, cum celi fabricam extenderet, vel mari terminum poneret, et omnia visibilia sive invisibilia mirabilis artifex componens, suo singula loco vel ordine distingueret. Et quidem placebant cuncta que fecerat quia erant valde (107) bona.¹³ Sed nusquam in omnibus illis se ipsum sibi complacuisse insinuat. In hoc autem uno sibi complacet et dicit *mihi complaeui*, quod longe aliud est quam si dixisset *tu mihi complaeisti*. Adtendamus ergo quid in Christo factum sit et videbimus quod vere pro magnitudine vel qualitate operis recte pater in illo sibi complacuerit, videlicet cum

¹ Phil. 2:7.

² MS. implesse.

⁹ Luke 4:14.

¹⁰ John 1:33.

³ Jer. 23:24.

⁴ Luke 1:46.

¹¹ Cf. John 5:17, 14:9, 1:13.

⁵ John 14:10.

⁶ Luke 11:20.

¹² Matt. 3:17, etc.

⁷ Acts 17:28.

⁸ John 1:14.

¹³ Gen. 1:10, 12, etc.

omnia fecisset Deus nichil omnino simile sibi vel equale fecerat, quamquam *ad imaginem et similitudinem sui hominem fecerit*.¹ Nec enim benivolentie creatoris sufficiebat quod ea que fecerat erant cuncta valde bona, quia nichil inter omnia simile sibi vel equale videbat, sed ut iam dictum est tale quid omnino qualis ipse est creari non poterat. Quapropter multitudo creature infirma utpote de nichilo facta partim corruerat, neque suis viribus ullomodo restaurari valebat. Suggessit igitur tune ipsa, que post apparuit in specie columbe, mitis et benevolia patris caritas, quatinus ipsam virtutem, ipsum verbum per quod omnia fecerat, quoniam nichil equale sibi condiderat facture sue uniret et sic unum quid, cui nichil decesset, in ordine creature produceret, essetque creatura licet dispar conditione, tamen compar creatori suimet in Deum assumptione et (108) glorificatione. Quo facto, gratulatus omnipotens bonitas et applaudit sibimet dilectio columbina omnis invidentie nescia quod ope sua compar sibi facta sit humana creatura, dignum laude iudicans quod inopi nature sue eiusdem sue naturae divitiis a Deo subvenerit ut totum regnum patris regere universam omnino celi ac terre rempublicam disponens, et in throno eius dominari eque ut ipse deinceps idonea sit. Hoc opus suum a Deo collaudat et in hoc sibi complacet in tantum ut euicunque non complauerit, quicumque eum laude et gratiarum actione non aspicerit, eum velut ingratum et vere superbum et invidum, a salute sua et ab eiusdem Christi, filii sui, regno repellat. Cuiusque utique regni, quia non est finis, cum sit immensem, recte quoque ipse rex immensus praedicatur, sicut ex opposito regulus dicitur, cuius regnum coangustatum est etiam si contingat ipsum gygantea statura extensum. Christus autem, id est, homo prae consortibus suis unctus in regem regni omnium seculorum, licet parvulus in cunis apparuerit, idem in throno maiestatis paternae magnitudine sue claritatis etiam angelorum pascit et toti curie celesti gaudium facit.

XXIV. DE GAUDIO DISCIPULORUM

Ad quod gaudium discipulos suos adhuc mortalis invitabat (109) dicens: *Si diligenteris me gauderetis utique quia ad patrem vado, quia pater maior me est*.² Cum enim ipse in divinitate sua numquam patre minor extiterit, luce clarius constat, quod hec dicens filius Dei de natura hominis egit tanquam diceret: Quamdiu mortalis homo sum pater maior me est, at postquam transibo ex hoc mundo ad patrem, exaltata videlicet humanitate mea usque ad paternae glorie ineffabilem celitudinem a qua numquam discessi per divinitatem, ex tunc videbitis me Dominum et salvatorem vestrum propter passionem mortis gloria et honore coronatum. Igitur si diligenteris me gauderetis utique transire meab exilio mundi et externaliter sessurum ad dexteram patris intrare in gloriam regni mei quia videlicet haec tenus ex quo carnem indui pater maior me est, et ego secundum mortalitatem eiusdem carnis non solum patre sed etiam immortalibus paulo minor sum angelis. Postquam vero usque ad patris consensem exaltatus fuero ex tunc implebitur quod scriptum est: *Dixit Dominus Domino (110) meo, Sede a dexteris meis*³ (et cetera). Item, *Gloria et honore coronasti eum, Domine, et constitueristi eum super opera manuum tuarum*.⁴ Quanta in hoc Christum diligentibus gaudendi causa est! Magna plane et ineffabilis. Unde nec illi plene inveniuntur Christum diligere, qui de iam facta hominis usque ad patrem exaltatione gaudientibus fidelibus nolunt congaudere, contendentes filium hominis eundemque Dei filium adhuc minorem patre in sua quantumlibet glorificata humanitate. Quam sane minoritatem, si referunt ad humanitatis naturalem conditionem, non ad eiusdem supernaturalem exaltationem recte tolerantur, quoniam in hoc sensu neque nobis neque fidei catholice adversantur, verum si hominis iam in Deum glorificati arbitrantur non eandem gloriam, omnipotentiam, omnisapientiam, omnivirtutem, omnimaiestatem, que est patris altissimi, timendum sine dubio est ne a regno ipsius repellantur tamquam detractores invidi cum illo consortium habituri qui primus invidit altitudini huius Altissimi dicens in corde suo: *Ero similis Altissimo*.⁵ Nos vero congau-

¹ Gen. 1:27.² John 14:28.⁴ Ps. 8:6 f.; MS. c. e. d. et c. e. s. o. m. t.³ Ps. 109:1; Matt. 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42.⁵ Isa. 14:14.

dentes nature (111) nostre in Dei verbo deificate et glorificate, deificate in conceptione, glorificate in resurrectione simul et ascensione, *accedamus cum fidutia ad tronum gratie*, sicut ait apostolus, *ut misericordiam consequamur et gratiam inveniamus in auxilio oportuno.*¹ Magnam quippe dat fidutiam nobis hominibus Deus homo in se naturaliter benedictus, qui venit in nomine Domini, pro nobis maledictum factus, ut nos natura filii ire filii benedictionis efficiamur in ipso. Licet enim contristare nos debeat quod nostra peccata causa mortis et contumelie illi fuerant, tamen quia ob eandem mortis contumeliam consecutus est homo assumptus magnam gloriam de qua dicit, *nonne sic oportuit pati Christum et ita intrare in gloriam suum?*² fiducia datur nobis peccatoribus ad tronum gracie ipsius puro corde accidentibus. Si enim Ioseph suis fratribus gratiam et misericordiam exinde promptius inpendit, quod, occasione malicie illorum Deo mala ipsorum vertente in bonum, fuit exaltatus, quomodo verus Ioseph cui peccavimus, Deo vertente in bonum (112) quod inique gessimus, propter nos passus malaque illi venerunt in bonum eredendus est non pareere nobis maxime si ad ipsum confugerimus, et corde contrito planxerimus quod peccavimus in ipsum fratrem nostrum eundemque Dominum et iudicem nostrum. Ac(e)cedamus igitur ut dixi cum fiducia ad tronum gracie, dominante ac residente super illum tronum fratre nostro, qui etiam non confunditur fratres nos vocare dicens: *Nuntiabo nomen tuum fratribus meis.*³ Postulemus ab eo alimenta nobis et parvulis nostris, nec a precibus quiescamus donec ipse manifestet se ipsum nobis, dicens: *Ego sum Ioseph,*⁴ vos cogitastis de me malum et Deus vertit illud in bonum, et exaltavit me sicut in presentiarum cernitis. Ostendat se nobis dominatorem non solum in celo sed etiam in tota terra Egypti, ordinando regnum totius mundi ad sui honorem, ad suorum consolationem. Deinde quoque accedamus cum fiducia ad tronum dignitatis apostolice praesidente nimirum tali fratre qui, ut speramus, etiam pauperes nostri similes recognoscet ut fratres.

XXV. DE BENIAMIN

Unde illo principante (113) speramus fratres eius conuterinos habundantius benedici quam non conuterinos; quomodo et ipse Ioseph cum reliquis fratribus penitentia condigna purgatis daret singulis binas stolas, Beniamin fratri suo uterino dedit trecentos sielos cum quinque stolis optimis, qui⁵ et in convivio recumbens cum fratribus quinque partibus habundasse super illos inventus est,⁶ ammirantibus ipsis fratribus et fortasse indignantibus quia non erat eis ipse Beniamin conuterinus, qui omnes de Lia vel de ancillis nati filios Rachelis eo quod a patre cunctis fratribus plus amarentur, non sincere primitus amaverunt donec postmodum correpti et correcti huiuscemodi emulationem deposuerunt. Nonne Ioseph qui legitur oves patris pavisse fratresque suos de crimine pessimo apud patrem accusasse, qui et postmodum pavit universam Egyptum, nomine simul et officio designat ordinem clericorum religiosorum criminis detestantium et regulari disciplina se ostendentium esse filios Rachelis (114) ecclesie videlicet primitive que quasi duos filios nobiles genuit⁷ Ioseph pastorem ovium, in ordine clericorum sub apostolica regula tam paterne nobilitatis, quam et materne puleritudinis insigne praeferentium, sicut de Ioseph legitur quod *erat decors aspectu*⁷ et Beniamin filium dextere in ordine monachorum item sub apostolica regula delectationes in dextera Dei querentium.

XXVI. DE CYPHO IOSEPH

Neque vero illud est otiosum quod ciphus Ioseph argenteus, disponente ipso Ioseph, in sacco Beniamin fuit repositus⁸ cuius figure veritatem nunc impleri videmus, quotiens de ordine monachorum secundum nomen Benonim,⁹ quod interpretatur filius doloris se et mundum lugentium et secundum nomen Beniamin⁹ quod est filius dextere delectaciones in dextera Dei querentium quis assumitur ad regimen sacerdotiale vel pontificale, sicut beatus papa Gregorius vere cipho Ioseph argenteo ditatus et in pontificem Romanum electus egregia (115) moralitatis pocula

¹ Heb. 4:16.² Luke 24:26.⁵ Gen. 43:34, 45:22.⁶ Gen. 41:50.³ Ps. 21:23; Heb. 2:12.⁴ Gen. 45:3 ff.⁷ Gen. 39:6.⁸ Gen. 44:2 ff.⁹ Gen. 35:18.

de ipso cipho ministravit. Notandum tamen quod ipse ciphus non dicitur esse Beniamin sed Iosephi, quia non ad monachi silentium, sed ad clericorum ministerium pertinet, quod is qui sic assumptus est in ecclesia docet, ut fratrem suum Ioseph adiuvet. Sic Petrus apostolus in sacerdotio princeps doctorum cum in sua nave Dominus resedisset atque inde turbas docuissest postea in altum ducta navicula cum laboraret ipse et frater suus Andreas intrahendo reti piscibus usque adeo repleto ut etiam rete rumperetur ascivit socios qui erant in alia navi, scilicet Iohannem et Iacobum, ut adiuverent eum.¹

XXVII. DE DUABUS NAVIBUS APOSTOLORUM

Navis Petri apostoli, ordo cleri apostolicis disciplinis informati non incongrue intelligitur. Navis autem Iohannis qui super pectus Domini recubuit apte notat monachorum religiosorum quietem sanctam, de qua nonnumquam sic excitantur et in adiutorium cleri vocantur, ut pulchrum exhibeant spectaculum Petri et Iohannis (116) Ioseph et Beniamin sese invicem fraterne amantium et adiuvantium in domo Iacob filios Rachelis plurimum diligentis. Fratres enim ceteri sive Lie sive ancillarum filii, licet incliti et benedicti, minus inveniuntur a patre dilecti,² maxime Rubenite, licet numero multi, tamen merito imminuti. Emulantur enim filios Ioseph crescere cum sui ut estimant aliquanta diminutione. Nam cum pene occupaverint una cum prebendis omnes plebales ecclesias conducticiis committendo eas in tota Germania et Gallia, dolent saltem sibi eas esse subreptas, quas vident et invident cenobiis religiosis episcopali concessione subtitulatas vel commissas. Nonne, inquiunt, sicut monachi et regulares canonici habent plebales ecclesias, ita et nos item canonici, licet seculares, habere possumus eas, quod si nobis non licet, utique nec illis, ut unaqueque ecclesia, cui facultas suppetit, proprium habeat sacerdotem?

XXVIII. DE RACHELE

He dicentes et spiritualibus viris avariciam (117) quasi scelus ydolatrie inpingentes, non adtendunt puleritudinem seu latitudinem vestimentorum pulcherrime Rachelis quibus teguntur ista ecclesiastica beneficia cenobiis collata, sicut illa texit idola de domo Laban³ surrepta. Denique habemus privilegia sedis apostolice, ut quicquid ex concessione pontificum vel donatione principum seu pia oblatione fidelium iuste possidemus, auctoritate apostolica teneamus, inter que nominatim aliquotiens exprimuntur ecclesie capelle ac decime. Nonne sic scribens ecclesia Romana quasi Rachel formosa expandit se super possessiones cenobiorum, ut non quasi avaricia, sed quasi benedictio indicentur que illius auctoritate ae benignitate a spiritualibus possidentur? Verumtamen nec ipsis viris religiosis hoc licere concedimus, ut in ecclesiis eorum sit conducticius vel minister absolute ordinatus, qualibet vase discurrentibus et se nunc hic nunc illic prostituentibus heu! plena est Germania et Gallia. Ipsi vero religiosi viri suas ecclesias aut per semetipsos regant, *sobrie, iuste, pie vivendo*⁴ et populum sibi commissum in id ipsum fideliter erudiendo, aut secundum canones obedientie stabilitatem exigant ab his, quos in adiutorium sui ad regendum populum volunt assumere, ne, si ovibus neglectis lanam et lac (118) accipiunt, non sub veste Racheline puleritudinis teeti ab avaricia, que est idolorum servitus,⁵ excusentur, sed tamquam idolatre ipsi eque ut seculares canonici dampnentur, immo etiam tanto illis deterius pereant, quanto speciem pietatis habentes et virtutem eius abnegantes dampnabilius peccant. Ubi enim salute animarum neglecta sola queruntur lucra terrena, ibi, quoniam⁶ habundat iniquitatis avaricia querentis que sua sunt, *refrigescet caritas*⁷ non querens que sua sunt. Que cum ex eo dinoscatur, quod communia propriis, non propria communibus anteponit, non habet locum in illis congregationibus, ubi omnes querunt que sua sunt,⁸ propria communibus, non communia propriis anteponendo, immo et si qua illic videntur incomunnia in privatas abusiones distrahendo. Siesic inordinate viventibus neque clericis neque monachis

¹ Luke 5:5 ff.

² Gen. 37:3 ff.

⁵ Eph. 5:5.

⁶ *Libelli*, quando.

³ Gen. 31:34.

⁴ Titus 2:12.

⁷ Matt. 24:12.

⁸ 1 Cor. 13:5.

ecclesias vel ecclesiastica bona defendimus, quia talibus congruit quod Indeis Christus¹ dicit: *Ideo auferetur a vobis regnum et dabitur genti facienti fructus eius.*² Item questus iniquos et turpes non aliquo velamine religionis defendendos, sed tamquam idolatriam eavendos iudicamus et velut immundiciam repudiamus, quia ubi talia pacienter sustinentur, non tam sub Raehele desuper sedente quam sub stramento cameli absconduntur idola. Sieut se habet istoria, ubi legitur ipsa Rachel subter stramento³ cameli, animalis scilicet inmundi, primitus idola posuisse ac deinde ipsa desuper sedisse, ut ostenderetur (119) differentia inter mundos, quibus omnia munda sunt,⁴ et inmundos et infideles, quibus nichil mundum, quorum etiam si qua religio practenditur, stramentis cameli assimilatur ac proinde repudiatur. Quia ergo in domo Iacob regnante Christo, ut supra memoravimus, Petrum Petrique successorem quemlibet nomine Iacob vel potius Israel recognoscimus honoratum, cum fiducia bona petamus ab eo iudicium super turpitudine Ruben, super furore Symeon et Levi,⁵ quatenus et non sinatur ultra crescere in domo Iacob, et illi *bellatores importuni* compellantur *se rasa iniuritatis* agnoscerem, qui eum sint clerici et clericorum magistri, longe indisciplinati movent guerras in domo Iacob quam laici principes.

XXIX. DE BELLIS INORDINATIS

Nam sine ordine iudicario eastra obsidentes, incendia facientes et inter hec homicidia multa perpetrantes atque insuper divina sacramenta dispensantes cogunt nos gemere non quidem super militia ecclesiis a regibus et imperatoribus data, sed super malitia ex occasione militie subintroducta. Unde non hoc desideramus, ut ecclesia perdat militiam, sed malitiam,⁶ prescripta vide- liet saluberrima regula, secundum quam pontifices uti et non abuti debeant ipsa militia. Et quidem regulas antiquas super hoc habemus in scriptis Nyeolai⁷ pape specialiter ad Carolum Francorum regem scribentis et universaliter in conciliis Toletanis depromptas,⁸ (120) quas non putamus canonum peritis Romanis ingerendas, maxime quia temporis novitas exigere videtur novas regulas, cum illis antiquis omnino sit iudicium ac negotium sanguinis interdictum sacerdotibus et reliquis personis Deo servientibus, nostri autem temporis qualitas fortasse aliud requirit, sicut ad beate memorie pontifices Romanos Innocentium et Eugenium⁹ seripsisse nos meminimus. Erat autem summa tunc nostre suggestionis, ut ecclesia sibi collatos honores tenendo uteretur et non abuteretur illis, gladium verbi per spiritales, gladium ferri per seculares ministros ordinate ac iudicialiter vibrando; ne levitis inordinate pugnantibus eveniat illa maledictio, qua maledicti sunt Symeon et Levi a patre Iacob,¹⁰ sed potius ipsis levitis ex obedientia iusta et iuste bellantibus proveniat illa benedictio, qua benedixit Moyses levitas, qui precipiente ipso pugnantes conseraverant manus suas in sanguine fratrum suorum. *Videns enim Moyses populum, quod esset nudatus, spoliaverat enim eum Aaron propter ignominiam sordis et inter hostes nudum constituerat, et stans in porta castrorum ait: Si quis est Domini, iungatur mihi. Congregatique sunt ad eum omnes filii Levi. Quibus ait: 'Hee dicit Dominus Deus Israel. Ponat vir gladium super femur suum. Ite et redite de porta usque ad portam per (121) medium castrorum et ocedat unusquisque fratrem suum et amicum et proximum suum.'* Fecerunt filii Levi iuxta sermonem Moysi. Cccideruntque in illo die quasi XXIII milia hominum. Et ait Moyses: *Consecratis manus vestras hodie Domino unusquisque in filio et fratre suo, ut detur vobis benedictio.*¹¹ Ecce hic filii Levi propter bellum inordinatum a

¹ *Libelli*, Dominus.² Matt. 21:43.590. Gerhoh quotes it also in his *Com. to Ps. LXIV*, chap. 61, and in *Dc Ordine Donorum*.³ *Libelli*, stramentum.⁴ Titus 1:15.⁸ Synod of Toledo, IV, chaps. 31 and 45; MANSI, Vol. X, cols. 628-30; HINSCHIUS, p. 369 f.; Synod of Toledo, XI, chap. 6; MANSI, Vol. XI, col. 141; HINSCHIUS, p. 409.⁶ Gen., chap. 34, and 49:5-7.
⁶ Cf. GERHON's *De Elegio Dei*, chaps. 23, 24, in which he criticises Adalbert II., archbishop of Mainz, for surrounding himself with a large body of knights, armed retainers, etc. *Libelli*, Vol. III, p. 153 f.⁹ To Innocent II. Gerhoh sent his *Dialogus Inter Regularem et Secularem Clericum*. To Eugene III. he sent his *Commentary on Ps. LXIV*.⁷ Nicholas I., 858-867, to Charles the Bald. Cf. MANSI, Vol. XV, col. 291; *Deus dedit. Coll. Can.*, Vol. IV, chap. 99, p. 416; *Grat.*, chap. XXIII, qu. 8; *J. L.*, 2788; *N. Archiv*, Vol. V,¹⁰ Gen. 49:6 f.; Ex. 32:25-29; Deut. 33:8-11.¹¹ Ex. 32:25 ff.

Iacob maledictis, item propter bellum ordinate peractum a Moyse promittitur benedictio in Exodo, que deprompta est in Deuteronomio,¹ quia nimirum sic erat futurum, ut benedictio in lege promissa filiis Levi daretur evangelio coruscante illis potissimum, qui ordinate procedunt ad bella, sive gladium spiritalem per semetipsos sive materialem per legitimos ministros movendo, ita ut quisque² miles prelietur suo modo et ordine, alter que sunt iusta docendo, alter docenti obediendo³ alter gladio spiritus, quod est verbum Dei, armatus dicat eum apostolo: *Arma nostra non sunt carnalia, sed potentia Deo ad destructionem munitionum extollentium se adversus scientiam Christi:*⁴ alter, ad preceptum saerdotis ingrediens et egrediens, imitetur Iosue ducem Israel, cui mandatum fuit a Domino, ut ad preceptum Eleazari sacerdotis⁵ egredetur et ingredetur scilicet ad pugnandum, ingredetur ad vacandum.

XXX. DE BENEDICTIONIBUS IACOB ET MOYSI

Puto autem consideratione dignum quod collatis et consideratis benedictionibus Iacob et Moysi⁶ super XII tribus cum satis concordent amborum sententie in re[li] quis tribubus de sola tribu Levi quasi opposita et pene contraria videntur proposuisse. Nam ille Iacob scilicet de Syneon et Levi ait: *Vasa iniquitatis bellantia, in consilio eorum ne veniat anima mea, et in cetero illorum non sit gloria mea quia in furore suo occiderunt virum et in voluntate sua suffoderunt murum. Maledictus furor eorum quia pertinax et indignatio eorum quia dura. Dividit eos in Iacob et disperdat eos in Israel.*⁷ Moyses autem dicit in benedictione Levi: *Perfectio tua et doctrina tua viro sancto tuo quem probasti in temptatione⁸ et iudicasti ad aquas contradictionis. Qui dixit palri suo et matri sue nescio vos et fratribus suis ignoros illos et nescierunt filios suos. Hi custodierunt eloquium tuum et pactum tuum servaverunt iudicia tua, O Iacob et legem tuam O Israel. Ponent thumama in furore tuo et holocaustum super altare. Benedic, Domini, fortitudine eius et opera manuum illius suscipe. Percute dorsum inimicorum eius et qui oderunt eum non consurgant.*⁹ (123) Unde, queso, ista diversitas in patriarcha et legislatore, ut alter maledicendo, et alter benedicendo loqueretur de unius tribus hominibus? Profecto non sine causa diversa diversitas ista. Nam de tribu illa erant futuri sacerdotes mali qui essent vasa iniquitatis bellantia et quorum furor pertinax et indignatio dura. Horum principiui fuerunt pontifices et Pharisei qui collegerunt concilium et inierunt consilium adversus Christum. De quo videlicet consilio et concilio intelligitur illud patriarche dictum in consilio eorum ne veniat anima mea et in cetero illorum non sit gloria mea quia in furore suo occiderunt virum. Secuntur eos adhuc nonnulli Christum in suis membris occidentes et furore pertinaci pauperes eius perseguentes maxime indisciplinati cathedrales clericis disciplinatis et regularibus adversantes furore pertinaci. Dico igitur in consilium eorum ne veniat anima mea et in cetero illorum non sit gloria mea. Et quia iniqui sunt ceteri eorum fiat secundum quod scriptum est dividam eos in Iacob et disperdat eos in Israel. Divisio et dispersio sive disperditio hec Levitarum perversorum per principes Romanos, Titum et Vespasianum¹⁰ ceptum per pontifices Romanos tandem consumetur ut veris et bonis Levitis in eorum locum introductis ac per ecclesiam totam multiplicatis illa detur benedictio que per Moysen deprompta sed (124) per verum legis latorem data est. Et enim benedictionem dedit nove legis lator quam veteris legis lator et si potuit praenuntiare non potuit dare. Perfectio, inquit, tua et doctrina tua viro quem probasti in temptatione.

XXXI. DE AQUA CONTRADICTIONIS

Virum probatum in temptatione cognoscimus Petrum apostolum et cum illo cetum apostolicum precipue *ad aquas contradictionis*,¹¹ apostolis videlicet Christum filium Dei credentibus hominibus autem huic fidei contradictientibus et aliis eum Iohannem, aliis Helyam, aliis Ieremiam

¹ Gen. 34; Ex. 32:25 ff.; Deut. 33:8 ff.

⁷ Gen. 49:5 ff. ⁸ MS. temptatione. ⁹ Deut. 33:8 ff.

² Libelli, quisquis,

³ Libelli, inserts a.

¹⁰ Refers to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, in

⁴ 2 Cor. 10:4f. ⁵ Num. 27:21.

⁶ Gen. 49, and Deut. 33.

⁷⁰ A. D.

¹¹ Ps. 80:8, 105:32.

aut unum ex prophetis esse dicentibus. Apud aquam contradictionis huius probata est fides apostolorum cum Petrus respondit pro omnibus *Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi.*¹ Perfectio quoque ac doctrina Christi dicentis *si vis perfectus esse vade quae habes et da pauperibus et sequere me,*² item, *qui non renuntiat omnibus que possidet non potest meus esse discipulus,*³ in illis et eorum sequacibus est inventa qui etiam parentes relinquendo ac filios suos nesciendo cum nudi nudum Christum sequerentur custodierunt eloquium Domini et pactum eius servaverunt. Unde prae ceteris hanc benedictionem promeruerunt: *Ponent thimama in furore tuo et holocaustum super altare tuo, quibus dictis commendatur eorum sacerdotium.* Conclusio vero totius benedictionis hec est: *Benedic, Domine, fortitudini eius et opera manuum eius suscipe. Percute (125) dura inimicorum eius et qui oderunt eum non consurgant.*⁴ Pulchre cum de sacerdotio⁵ loquens pluraliter praemississet de istis filiis Levi “*ponent thimama in furore tuo*” de principatu locuturus ad singularem numerum transiens ait “*Benedic Domine fortitudini eius,*” etc. Inter ceteros enim Christi apostolos unus constitutus est princeps apostolorum cui et dictum est: *Confirm frates tuos.*⁶ Nonne magna et benedicta est fortitudo principatus illius, cui *porte inferi non poterunt prevalere?*⁷ Item quod dicitur: *Percute dura inimicorum eius et qui oderunt eum non consurgant,*⁸ nostris in diebus etiam ad literam factum cernimus, cum populus Romanus principatu apostolico inimicus nuper cesus est non in facie tamquam strenue pugnans, sed in dorso tamquam ignaviter fugiens ante faciem principatus apostolici et imperatoris ab illo coronati.⁹

XXXII. DE PRINCIPATU LEGITIME ORDINATO

Sic in principatu legitime ordinato nostris in diebus *exurgat Deus et dissipentur inimici eius et fugiant qui oderunt eum a facie eius.*¹⁰ Gaudemus plane gaudendumque censemus populo Christiano sic humiliato populo Romano, quia populus urbis magis inde superbiens quod dicatur populus Romanus, quam inde gaudere volens ut dicatur populus Christianus, contra leges divinas erigit potestes inordinatas,¹¹ *quibus qui resistunt Dei ordinationi utique non resistunt, quoniam que a Deo sunt ordinata sunt.*¹² Memini me (126) cum fuisse in urbe,¹³ contra quandam Arnoldinum¹⁴ valenter literatum in palatio disputasse, et ipsa disputatio, monente papa Eugenio, reducta in scriptum pluribus auctoritatibus aggregatis, posita est in serinio ipsis, ubi cum adhuc possit inveniri, non opus est iam scripta iterum scribi.

XXXIII. DE REGALIBUS COLLATIS

Attamen adhuc *eadem scribere mihi quidem non pigrum,*¹⁵ sicubi videretur necessarium, sicut illud quod ibidem copiose tractatum est et nunc succincte perstringendum videtur de regalibus ecclesie collatis. De his enim cum alii contendant ecclesiis eadem occasione talium periclitantibus auferenda, alii vero ea semel ecclesiis collata in usus earum tenenda,¹⁶ posterior magis placet sententia quia, sic ipsa regalia bona ecclesiasticis interserta sunt, ut vix ab invicem discerni valeant. Huc accedit, quod *que Deus coniunxit homo separare non debet.*¹⁷ Coniunxit

¹ Matt. 16:13 ff.; Mark 8:27 ff.; Luke 9:18 ff.

² Matt. 19:21; Mark 10:21; Luke 18:22.

³ Luke 14:33.

⁴ Deut. 33:8 ff.

⁵ MS. sacerdotium.

⁶ Libelli, snos. Luke 22:32.

⁷ Matt. 16:18.

⁸ Deut. 33:11.

⁹ A reference to the battle between the Romans and Frederick I. on the day of his coronation by Adrian IV., June 18, 1155; cf. OTTO OF FREISING, *Gesta Friderici*, Book II, par. 33.

¹⁰ Ps. 67:2.

¹¹ In 1143 the lower nobility in Rome rebelled against the Pope, expelled him from the city and established a government of their own. Adrian IV. was, at the time Gerhoh

wrote this letter, in Benevento, because he was not allowed to enter Rome.

¹² Rom. 13:2.

¹³ Cf. Com. to Ps. 54, Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. CXCIII, col. 1672. Com. Ps. 64 Migne, Vol. CXCIV, col. 19. Com. Ps. 65 Migne, CXCIV, col. 139.

¹⁴ A follower of Arnold of Brescia. Probably the same disputation which Gerhoh mentions in his Com. to Ps. 64.

¹⁵ Phil. 3:1.

¹⁶ Gerhoh had, in his earliest writings, urged that the churches be deprived of the regalia, in order to end the struggle about investiture.

¹⁷ Matt. 19:6.

vero ea Deus Christus in sua propria persona induitus apud Herodem primo veste alba,¹ que saecordotalis est, deinde apud Pilatum² veste purpurea, que regalis est, ut ostenderet, se non solum ex pontificali, sed etiam ex imperiali dignitate super omnes principatus totius orbis dominaturum. Dicis itaque mihi: *Si non debent ecclesiis auferri ipsa regalia, ex quibus episcopi habentes ea debent Cesari que Cesaris sunt, sicut ex ecclesiasticis facultatibus (127) Deo que Dei sunt,³ quomodo puniri poterunt episcopi vel abbates notentes reddere Cesari que Cesaris sunt, cum eadem auferri eis non poterunt, ne, sicut oblatio talium in sanctuario fuit devota, sic oblatio eorum a sanctuario fiat sacrilega?* Respondeo plane mihi placere, ut reddantur que sunt Cesaris Cesari, et que Dei Deo, sed sub ea cautela, ut non vastetur ecclesia vel nudetur saltem veste alba, si nimis incaute abstrahitur ei purpura. Fecerunt hoc milites illi pagani, qui Christum spoliaverunt veste⁴ utraque nudum crucifigendum, sed absit ut id ipsum faciant milites Christiani. Verumtamen ut insolentia non erescat ultra modum contra imperium, ex necessitate iusurandum, licet hoc ipsum sit a malo, interponitur, ut sibi fidem servent mutuo pontifices et reges,⁵ quemadmodum patriarcha fidelis Abraham contentione orta pro eadem sopiaenda et in posterum cavenda iuravit regi Abimelech⁶ et ille sibi secus puteum iuramenti. Ergo sicut illi sibi mutuo iuraverunt, sic adhuc reges iurant iusticiam ecclesie, eum conseruantur et coronantur, et episcopi quoque regalia tenentes regibus iurant fidelitatem salvo sui ordinis officio. Si ergo fuerit violatum iurisiurandi sacramentum, violator, sit abbas aut episcopus, iure utroque spoliatur honore eorum suo iudice saecordotali (128) scilicet et illo quem de regalibus habet. Si enim periurus episcopus tenens episcopatum, spoliandus regalibus exponatur militibus inde consequetur confusio magna, qua invalecente minimentur et vastabuntur ecclesiastica bona, dum nimis incaute abstrahentur ipsa regalia et ita scindetur pallium Samuelis,⁷ quo seiso seindetur et regnum et periclitatur⁸ saecordotium. Quod ita demum precaveri poterit, si episcopus non nisi prius alba veste induitus purpuram suscipiat,⁹ quam nec amittat, nisi et alba propter infidelitatem carere debeat, ut videlicet peccatum persone in detrimentum non vertatur ecclesie; sicut iam alieubi factum scimus personis quibusdam inordinate purpuratis, antequam veste alba prout oportuit induerentur, dum needum spiritualiter post electionem examinati aut consercati, sunt regalibus ampliati et ita nimis confortati, ut postmodum non potuerunt examinari, sed oportet eos ad placitum regis et militum consercati. Similiter personis quibusdam ante iudicium spirituale depuratis contigit ecclesiastica bona vastari, minui et scindi, seiso consequenter et regno, sicut Samuelis pallio (129) seiso scissum est regnum a Saule pallium saecordotale seidente. Enimvero arbitrantur quidam iuxta illud apostoli: *Non prius quod spirituale, sed quod animale est*¹⁰ animalia et temporalia, que a regibus habentur, primitus electe persone conferenda et inde spiritualia spirituali¹¹ consecratione percipienda, quod esset primitus purpurea, deinde alba veste indui contra ordinationem ipsius Christi qui primitus alba, deinde purpurea veste voluit in passione sua indui. Quibus humiliter suggerimus, ut apostoli verba premissa dicta sciant non de *novo*, sed de *veteri Adam*, in quo non prius quod spirituale, sed quod animale hoc prius erat.

XXXIV. COLLATIO VETERIS ADE AD NOVUM

Formavit enim Dominus hominem de limo terre secundum id quod in homine animale seu etiam corporale est, ae inde *inspiravit in faciem eius spiraculum vite*,¹² quod spiraculum spirituale est. Atque ideo episcopi secundum ipsum formati creduntur, qui prius in corporalibus,

¹ Luke 23:11.² John 19:2.³ Matt. 22:21.⁶ Gen. 21:23 ff.⁷ Sam. 15:27 ff.⁴ Cf. Matt. 27:35; Mark 15:24; John 19:23 f.⁸ *Libelli*, periclitabitur.⁵ Gerhoh here refers to the oath which the emperor took to the pope at the time of his coronation by the latter, and to the oath which the pope took to the emperor, and also to the oaths which the bishops took to the emperor when invested by him with the regalia.⁹ Which would be contrary to the terms of the Concordat of Worms.¹⁰ Cor. 15:46.¹¹ *Libelli* omits.¹² Gen. 2:7.

deinde in spiritualibus persicuntur. Secundus vero Adam prius erat in spiritu ac deinde cepit esse in corpore, quod cum ipse in spiritu et spiritus esset, propter nos accepit mortale sive animale; ac proinde secundum ipsum fiunt episcopi, qui primo regulariter electi et spiritualiter examinati atque consecrati postremo propter imminentem necessitatem super albam vestem suscipiunt et purpuream, (130) ne hac repudiata periclitetur ecclesia ipsis commissa. Qua si obrepente perfidia in regnum commissa indicabuntur spoliandi, veste simul alba sunt privandi, ne item periclitetur ecclesia cum sui honoris integritate illi auferenda et alteri committenda, ut sola puniatur persona perfida, ecclesia permanente in integritate sua, quoniam, ut dictum est, que *Deus coniunxit non est bonum, ut homo separet.*¹

XXXV. DE PURPURA REGIS VINCTA CANALIBUS

Sint ergo pariter in una persona vestis alba et purpurea, sed ita, ut sit purpura regis iuncta canalibus, frequenter scilicet in illis canalibus tinguenda, quibus et purpura Christi regis intincta dum regni sui omnia consilia et negotia secundum beneplacitum Dei patris ordinavit promovenda. Unde Pilato aliam sibi tinturam offerenti et ingerenti respondit: *Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo.*² Ac si diceret: Non me regem nego, sed regnum meum non est de hoc mundo, quia nec ego secundum beneplacitum huius mundi regnare dispono, neque per favorem huius mundi regnum mihi collatum recognosco. Item, aliam tinturam offerebant ei fratres eius dicentes: *Transi hinc et vade in Iudeam ut et discipuli tui videant opera tua que facis. Nemo quippe in occulto quid facit et querit ipse in palam* (132)³ *esse. Si hec facis, manifesta te ipsum mundo. Neque enim fratres eius credebant in eum.*⁴ Ecce canale plenum sordibus mundane glorie in quod iste rex glorie purpuram suam nolebat intingere. Respondens enim dixit istis consiliariis indiscretis: *Tempus meum nondum advenit, tempus autem restrum semper est paratum. Non potest mundus odire vos, me autem odit quia ego testimonium perhibeo de illo quia opera eius mala sunt. Vos ascendite ad diem hunc, ego autem non ascenderem quia tempus meum nondum advenit.*⁵ Maluit autem iste rex glorie, mutuando consilio de canalibus divine scripture ita regnare, ut haberet odium mundi quam laudes mundi captando suam regalem purpuram sordidare, sicut nunc purpuram suam sordidant qui pro ampliando numero militum beneficiant vel potius immaleficiant non solun que habent regalia, sed insuper ecclesiastica bona, etiam decimas, usui solius pietatis divinitus mancipatas. Et revera isti digni essent nudari non solum purpuram sed etiam cumulum malitie, portionem sacerdotum in decimis eatenus in usu ecclesiastico qualitercumque habitis diminurunt atque in laicas abusiones transferunt, sacrum de sacro auferentes atque in hoc sacrilegium grande committentes.

XXXVI. DE DECIMIS

Cum enim secundum canones exceptis ecclesiis vite communis, ubi asserente (133) sancto Gregorio nulla decimarum sive oblationum facienda est portio, sicut idem beatus instruit Augustinum Anglorum archiepiscopum, quatuor fieri debeant portiones de decimis et oblationibus ex omnibus his partibus, vix illa sola remansit ecclesie que ad clericos pertinere videbatur ceteris decimarum partibus in laicorum beneficia⁶ immo maleficia profligatis. Verum quia clerici per divites ecclesias constituti videbantur episcopis aliquibi superhabundare, cathedrales canonici clericos ipsos plebales vel ecclesias eorum suscepserunt ab episcopis in beneficium, et ipsi a Deo comminuerunt portionem sacerdotum, trahentes pene omnia in suas abusiones, ut non possunt inveniri clerici, qui talibus portiunculis vellent esse contenti nisi vilissimi concubinarii conducticii, usurarii, aleatores, venatores, negotiatores, girovagi absolute ordinati, sacerdotum filii⁷

¹ Matt. 19:6.² John 18:36.⁶ *Libelli*, beneficium.³ Through carelessness the number 131 was omitted.⁷ No doubt very unpalatable to Adrian IV. since he was⁴ John 7:3 ff.⁵ John 7:6 ff.

the son of a priest.

ceterique in hunc modum sacris officiis indigni. Cui malo volens remediari beate memorie Papa Eugenius in Remensi concilio statuit *ut unaqueque ecclesia, cui facultas suppetit, proprium habeat sacerdotem, cui de bonis ecclesie tantum prebeatur beneficium unde convenienter valeat sustentari.*¹ Occasione huius capituli subtrahuntur multa sacerdoti plebem regenti et exinde inbeneficiantur laici, quasi non sufficiat magnitudo illius antiqui sacrilegii, quo preter clericorum partes pene (134) omnia laici occupaverunt, nisi accedat illis et portio clericorum de novo noviter invento sacrilegio. Interdum quoque suis capellanis talia beneficia decimarum prestant, et hoc esset utcumque tolerabile, nisi quod decime semel ab ecclesiis abalienate ac sub nomine beneficiorum prestite, licet cathedralibus clericis vel capellanis, illis decedentibus facile succedunt laici in locum talis beneficii, quod et iam factum scimus.

XXXVII. DE PARASCEVE

Unde malum simile futurum timentes, hoc ipsum nunc sollicitudini apostolice suggerimus ut in ista paraseeve² qua altaria sie penitus nudantur ut nec panniculus hucusque illis relietus relinquatur, saltem una hora evigilet Petrus, lamentationibus Ieremiae plorantis excitatus et mulierum sedentium ad monumentum Iesu planetu attonitus, dum quasi extinctis in ecclesia Dei luminaribus expectatur a fidelibus divina contra tantas desolationes consolatio in qua post lamentationes Ieremie sonet illud canticum in auribus ecclesie realiter quod in pascali vigilia profertur vocaliter archidiacono dicente:

XXXVIII. DE VIGILIA PASCE

*Exultet iam angetica turba ectorum et pro tanti regis victoria tuba insonet salutaris. Gaudet tellus tantis irradiata fulgoribus eterni regis splendore illustrata totius orbis se sentiat amississe caliginem. Letetur et mater ecclesia tanti luminis (135) adornata fulgoribus.*³

Nudatis in paraseeve altaris et extinctis noctu luminaribus non canticum leticie sed planetus tristie auditur in ecclesia sed in candela quam Zosimus⁴ Papa saeculi statuit quasi columpna ignis pariterque accensis aliis luminaribus pascali festo congruentibus atque ornato sollempni vestitis altaris quasi pro summi regis victoria tuba intonat salutaris amicos ipsius victoris letificans et hostes altarium eius nudatores et luminum suorum extintores conturbans. *Quis scit si convertatur et ignoscatur Deus peccatis*⁵ nostris quibus iram meruimus et *relinquit post se benedictionem* qua super ecclesiam Dei thesaurarita et manifestata vel in pascali vigilia universali resurrectione proxima exultet iam angelica turba celorum exultent divina misteria dum pro Christi regis eterni victoria tuba intonet salutaris. Quenam hec tuba est nisi tuba novissima cuius in Apocalipsi clangor praecauditus est in hunc modum: *factum est regnum huius mundi Domini nostri et Christi eius et regnabit in secula seculorum.*⁶ In principio nove gratie secrete unus angelus non quasi tuba grandisona sed tamquam sibilus aure lenis auribus virginis insonuit, dicens: *Ecce concipies et paries filium et dabit illi Dominus Deus sedem David patris eius et regnabit in domo, Iacob, in eternum (136) et regni eius non erit finis.*⁷ At in novissima tuba faete sunt voces magne in celo dicentes: *Factum est regnum huius mundi Domini nostri et Christi eius et regnabit in secula seculorum. Et XXIII seniores qui in conspectu Dei sedent in sedibus suis occiderunt in facies suas et adoraverunt Deum dicentes: Gratias agimus tibi Domine Deus omnipotens qui es et qui eras qui accepisti virtutem tuam magnam et regnasti et irate sunt gentes et advenit tua ira et tempus mortuorum iudicari et*

¹The council at Rheims, 1148, can. 10; Mansi XXI, col. 716.

²On Good Friday, after the mass, it is the custom to strip all the altars in all the churches of their vestments and decorations. This is done as a symbol of sorrow, and the altars remain thus completely denuded until the next day when they are again decorated and put in order for service.

³This is sung in the service of blessing the candles on the Saturday of Holy Week. The full text is to be found in the missal. It is popularly attributed to St. Augustine, but on what ground I do not know.

⁴Zosimus, 417-18.

⁵Joel 2:14; Jonah 3:9.

⁶Rev. 11:15.

⁷Luke 1:31 ff.

*reddere mercedem tuis servis prophetis et timentibus nomen tuum pusillis et magnis, et exterminandi eos qui corruerunt terram.*¹ Quod regnum huius mundi ad gloriam Christi regnantis in domo Iacob sit omnino translatum vero Ioseph super currum Pharaonis exaltato quodque inde irate sint gentes inaniter super hoc frementes,² non indiget expositionem, ipsa rerum evidenter demonstrante verum Joseph in tota terra Egypti dominantem et regnante in domo Iacob. Dominus quippe generaliter omnium, specialiter est rex bonorum et fidelium quibus et reddet mercedem, sibi digne ministrantes honorificando, et exterminando eos qui corruerunt terram, corrupti videlicet et abhominales facti in studiis suis. Inter omnes autem et super omnes qui corruerunt terram notabilis et culpabilis ille magis invenitur de quo in Esaia legitur: *In terra sanctorum inique gessit* (137) *et non videbit gloriam Domini.*³ Cum enim dicat sanctus Job: *Terra data est in manus inpiorum,*⁴ quod exponente Gregorio, de corpore Christi ac deinde quoque de sanctorum corporibus intelligi potest, qui corpus Christi de quo scriptum est: *Non dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem*⁵ quantum in ipsis est corrumpunt rursum crucifigentes et ostentui habentes *rei facti corporis et sanguinis eius indigne sacramentis eius participando* et sanguinem Testamenti Novi coneulcando, ipsi merito exterminandi sunt, id est, excommunicandi, vel nunc, si eorum praevericatio manifesta est, vel in divino iudicio, quando, in finem canente hac septima et novissima tuba,⁶ non erit qui se abscondat a clangore eius. Cum autem nunc a pluribus gratie Dei contumelia fiat et ipsa in luxuriam seu maliciam transferatur quia hoc sacrilegium publice commissum latere non potest, cum facta eorum sint manifesta praecedentia ad indicium, iure a indicibus ecclesie forent exterminandi, si non iudices ipsi essent actores vel auctores tanti saerilegii. Actores enim sunt cum ipsis hoc faciant, auctores cum suos clericos ad idem iuvant, praestando illis ecclesiastica beneficia que rursum ipsi clericorum praestant militibus aut expendunt in luxuriis et in pudicieis, episcopis eorum hoc scientibus, neque enim in occulto fiunt ista, et minime prohibentibus, immo eos qui (138) talia inprobant odientibus et consequentibus. Huc aeedit quod pro scuto sue defensionis usurpat sibi praenotatum capitulum Remensis concilii arbitrantes hoc sibi permisum, dummodo sacerdos ecclesie ad placitum eorum, non secundum diffinitiones canonum, accipiat, unde, sicut illic dictum est, convenienter sustentari valeat, ut quod illi superest prout volunt expendant vel militibus infeodando vel clericis cathedralibus prestanto, qui ipsis non prohibentibus eadem prestant militibus vel expendant in suis mulieribus.

XXXIX. DE ABHOMINATIONE DESOLATIONIS

Atque ita sive per episcopos sive per clericos inbeneficiantes, dum semel in manus laicorum venerint res ecclesie, ille quoque de quibus actenus ministri altaris qualescumque sustentabantur et altaria vestiebantur, ecclesie ornabantur, post antiquam desolationem nostris in diebus augmentata desolatione potest cognosci *abominationis desolationis in quolibet loco sancto*⁸ suis pertinentiis omnino spoliato et denudato atque in laicas abusiones alienatis rebus, que si ministri altaris alicubi habundare viderentur, non militibus aut in pudicieis mulieribus, sed Christi pauperibus aut cum Petro et Augustino militantibus aut cum Iohanne ac sancto Benedicto⁹ sic manentibus, ut de ipso Iohanne dictum: *Sic eum volo manere,*¹⁰ aut certe cum Lazaro¹¹ mendicantibus erat dandum quod superesset iuxta illud evangelicum: *Quod superest date et omnia munda erunt vobis.*¹² Certe ut multum condescendatur in ista causa, si episcopi vellent suos cathedrales clericos iuvari de superabundantia plebanorum sacerdotum, rectius et tolerabilius illa superabundantia plebanis detracta firmari poterat in commune stipendum fratribus in eongregatione viventibus a preposito distribuenda, prout cuique opus esset, quam quod aliquo fratrum de multarum ecclesiarum beneficiis ditato et altero in sua paupertate neglecto

¹ Rev. 11:15; cf. Rev. 5.² Ps. 2:1.⁹ St. Benedict, the founder of the Benedictine order of monks.³ Is. 26:10.⁴ Job 9:24.¹¹ Luke 16:19 ff.⁵ Ps. 15:10; Acts 2:27, 13:35.⁶ 1 Cor. 11:27.¹⁰ John 21:22.¹³ Luke 11:41.⁷ Rev. 11:15.⁸ Matt. 24:15.

alius quidem esurit, alias autem ebrius est, quod apostolus in Corinthiis improbat.¹ dum habentes confundunt eos qui non habent, ac proinde apostolo iudice sic illis convenientibus in unum iam non est dominicam cenam manducare. Multo autem convenientius esset, ut ipsi plebani retentantes omnia, que secundum canones ad se pertinent, cogerentur de sibi conditis rebus recte agere, sufficientes ministros canonice sibi aggregatos una secum fraterne sustentando. Et hoc fortasse intendit papa Eugenius decernens, tantum sacerdoti relinquendum, unde convenienter sustentari valeat.² Ille dixit 'convenienter,' sed nunc agitur valde inconvenienter, dum et sacerdos ultra modum pariterque sibi commissa ecclesia depauperatur, et id quod ei detrahitur ecclesie alienatur et mundo immundo, qui *in maligno positus est*,³ confertur, ut fiat (140) supra modum nuda ecclesia, non habens vel panniculos hucusque sibi relictos ad verecunda saltem sua tegenda. Neque vera nos hec dicendo favemus ipsorum plebanorum irreligiositati, sed *vellemus* peccata personarum non verti in detrimentum ecclesiarum immo *vellemus* ipsas personas emendari vel mutari, manente omnimodis ecclesiarum substantia in usum ecclesiastico vel ipsorum plebanorum vel aliorum pauperum vel certe saltem ipsius episcopi procurantis ecclesias, monasteria, xenodochia,⁴ pauperesque alios, ut ipsis distribuerentur per eum, *prout cuique opus esset*.⁵

XL. DE VESTIMENTO MIXTO SANGUINE

Nam de militia, quam exinde augent episcopi vel eorum clerici ultra modum ditati, quid dicam? Nunquid regalis eorum pompa censenda est esse *purpura regis iuncta canalibus*?⁶ Hoe fortasse ipsi putant, sed verius estimatur esse *vestimentum mixtum sanguine* quod iudicante propheta erit in combustionem quia *omnis violenta praedatio cum tumulto et vestimentum mixtum sanguine erit in combustionem*⁷ et *cibus ignis*,⁸ eo quod non facile potest emundari a mixtura sanguinis. Huiusmodi vestis maxime ubi sit quod dictum est in Apocalipsi *ut qui in sordibus est sordescat adhuc et qui nocet noceat adhuc*.⁹ Etenim si is qui in sordibus est vere penitens nollet ultra sordescere et qui nocet amplius nocere caveret, vestimentum licet mixtum sanguine cibus ignis (141) minime fieret, sed iuxta doctrinam prophetae querentibus iudicium, subvenientibus oppresso, defendantibus viduam, quiescentibus agere perverse, discentibus benefacere, auferentibus malum cogitationum suarum ab oculis Domini, *si essent peccata eorum ut coccinum qui color est rubeus sanguineus quasi nix dealbarentur*.¹⁰ Hec autem sacrilegiis antiquis in decimarum alienatione commissis adientes nova sacrilegia, sicut longe sunt quidam eorum a vera penitentia, sic longe sunt a vera indulgentia. Quidam tamen per gratiam Dei, vexatione auditui eorum dante intellectum, discunt et sentiunt, verum esse quod propheta dicit:¹¹ *Multiplicasti gentes et nou magnificasti leticiam*,¹² quia, multiplicata illis militum copia numerosa, incepit ipsa militia simul cum malitia sua esse onerosa. Et tamen tantus est ardor insanie qua res ecclesie student alienare ut quidam licet formidantes infeodare decimas, tamen non formident aliis modis illaqueare illas scilicet vel impignorando, vel sic, nescio quibus artificiis, tolerando, ut laici eas possideant, quoadusque ab ecclesiis alienate in laicas abusiones transeant.

Audivi nuper de quodam episcopo,¹³ cuius nomen ad presens taceo, quod predia ecclesie sibi commisso laicis infeodavit, super quibus non infeodandis anathema promulgatum fuit (142) me presente a legato sedis apostolice cardinali Octaviano,¹⁴ tribus episcopis, et multis viris religiosis illi cooperantibus et sermonem huius anathematis confirmantibus extinetis candelis in

¹¹ Cor. 11:20 ff.²The Council at Rheims, 1148, can. 10; MANSI, Vol. XXI, col. 716.³ 1 John 5:19.⁴ MS., Xenochia.⁵ Acts 4:35.⁶ Song of Sol. 7:5.⁷ *Libelli* omits "quia omnis . . . in combustionem."⁸ Isa. 9:5.⁹ Rev. 22:11.¹⁰ Isa. 1:16-18.¹¹ *Libelli*, dicit.¹² Isa. 9:3.¹³ From GERHON's *Com. to Ps. CXXXIII* it is apparent that he here refers to Conrad, bishop of Augsburg.¹⁴ Octavian first appears in a papal document as cardinal deacon of St. Nicolans in Carceri Tulliano, 1138, April 9. In 1153, March 30, he appears as cardinal presbyter of St. Cecilia. In papal politics he was the leader of the faction in the college of cardinals which favored the German emperor. On the death of Adrian IV., 1159, he contested the election of Alexander III., receiving the votes of his party. He is reckoned as an anti-pope and known as Victor IV.

signum videlicet, quod esset extinguendus episcopus, qui contra illud anathema faciens laicis prestaret predia ecclesiasticis usibus a suo predecessore collata, etiam ea que tunc episcopus habuit ad mensam suam. Et ecce, ut vulgo dicitur et rei evidentia comprobatur, illa predia ecclesiastica usui ecclesie subtracta et laicis infeodata sunt.

Mundi Roma caput si non uleiscitur illud,
Que caput orbis erat causa fit ut¹ pereat,²

ait quidam, versificando propter improbandum quoddam similiter nefandum nefas. Nos vero, his malis crebrescentibus, non versificando, sed orando, pulsamus ad ostium gracie divine, ut Petrus inter hec dormiens a Domine excitetur, quatinus per illum bene vigilantem sacrilegii episcoporum simulque clericorum cathedralium de rebus ecclesie milites sibi multiplicantium rationabiliter obvietur, ita ut contenti sint episcopi de solis regalibus antiquitus infeodatos milites et principes conservare in defensione ecclesie qualemcumque desinantque novos de novis beneficiis multiplicare, maxime de decimis ac ceteris oblationibus ecclesiastico usui collatis, ut fiat secundum verbum Christi dicentis: *Reddite que sunt* (143) *Cesaris Cesari, et que sunt Dei Deo*,³ dum et Christo servitur de decimis et liberis oblationibus fidelium, et regi sive imperatori de regalibus et imperialibus obsequium persolvitur in consiliis bonis et competentibus auxiliis ecclesie simul et regno utilibus atque ante omnia honori et timori divino competentibus. Petrus enim apostolus dicturus: *Regem honorificate*, premisit: *Deum timete*:⁴ ut in omnibus, quibus regem honorificamus vel honorificandum predicamus, *timorem Dei pre oculis habeamus*.⁵ Quanto magis in ceteris principibus et laicis honorificandis et ditandis episcopi ceterique spirituales viri, quibus commissa sunt victualia pauperum, pre oculis habere debent illud iudicium tremendum, quo impios arguet Dominus *pro mansuetis terre*.⁶ Notandum sane quod pro mansuetis celi qui sunt sancti angeli non arguentur in pii sed pro mansuetis terre dicente iudice: *Esuriri et non dedistis mihi manducare, sitiiri et non dedistis mihi bibere* (etc., usque), *quandiu non fecistis uni de minimis meis nee mihi fecistis*.⁷ Isti minimi Christi sunt mansueti terre quibus cum subtrahuntur debita stipendia ira divina irritatur super impios maxime inde inexcusabiles quod episcoporum seu clericorum legem Dei scientium nomine simul et officiis honorificantur et tamen contraria suo nomine suoque honori scienter et sine respectu (144) divini timoris operantur. Verum de his plura loqui ad presens omittimus et tibi, pater Adriane, qui regimen tenes in domo Iacob, talia multa his similia per te consideranda relinquimus atque, ut id competentius possis, libelum “*De Consideratione*” ab abbe Clavarallense predecessori tuo sanete recordationis Eugenio papae dictatum sic legens considerare curato, quasi optime congruentem sancto apostolatu tuo. Nam cum tu sicut ille homo es sub potestate divina constitutus et regularibus disciplinis exercitatus habens sub te pontifices. Et hoc est miserabile, quod dicas huic: “*Vade*” et non vadit, et alteri: “*Veni*”⁸ et non venit. Si tamen tu illud dicas, quod antecessores tui dixerunt Innocentius et Eugenius, quibus emittentibus precepta saluberrima in suis conciliis nondum est obedientia exhibita, Deo fortasse ordinante ut quod illi seminaverunt tu meteres et in labores eorum tu introires. In hoc enim verbum verum⁹ est, quia *alius est qui seminat, alius qui metet*.¹⁰

XLI. DE INAURIBUS THEREBINTO SUFFODIENDIS

Insuper tibi regimen tenenti, sicut dictum est, in domo Iacob, complaceat exemplum patriarche Iacob qui portatas ad se inaures filiorum et filiarum ad se pertinentium, infudit eas subter therebintum¹¹ profecto significans hoc facto eos qui a veritate auditum avertentes ad fabu-

¹ MS., et.

² The poem from which this couplet is quoted was edited by Wattenbach, *Anzeiger für Kunde der deutschen Vorzeit*, Vol. XX (1873), p. 101. These lines are found also in a poem published in the *N. Archiv*, Vol. VIII, p. 191. Cf. also *N. Archiv*, Vol. XIV, p. 448.

³ Matt. 22:21.

⁵ Rom. 3:18; Ps. 13:3.

⁷ Matt. 25:42 ff.

⁹ *Libelli, vestrum.*

¹¹ Gen. 35:4.

⁴ 1 Pet. 2:17.

⁶ Ps. 75:10; Job 24:4.

⁸ Matt. 8:9.

¹⁰ Jn. 4:37 f.

las autem conversi eo acervant sibi magistros pruriētes auribus (145) humiliandos esse sub ministerium crucis dominice, ut noverint illum sapientiorem qui *nichil se scire fatebatur nisi Christum Iesum et hunc crucifixum*¹ quam coacervatos illos magistros do quorum doctrina non fulget ecclēsia sed fumant scolae plures in Francia et aliis terris per maxime a duabus cauditionum fumigantium, videlicet, Petri Abailardi et episcopi Gilliberti.

XLI. NOVITATES IN DOCTRINA FILII DEI

Quorum discipuli eorum dictis et scriptis inbuti hominem verbo Dei unitum negant esse filium Dei Deum dicendum nisi accidentalē, ut aiunt, connexionē. Item negant divinitatem verbi incarnatam. Dicunt personas divinas et earum proprietates extra substantiam Dei considerandas. Dicunt ipsas proprietates personis forinsecus affixas, unde nec ipsas nec earum unitates dicunt inesse sed adesse divinitati, ipsasque personas etsi divinitate esse vel divinitatem appellari non tamen divinitatem esse fatentur, sed et ipsam divinitatem qua Deum esse affirmant esse Deum negant, eritque secundum eos Deus iam non perfecte simplex si alio est quod est, et aliud ipse est et sic inveniretur aliquid Deo melius hoc scilicet quod conferret ei ut esset Deus. Dicunt in Deo quattuor unitates inter se distinctas, unam unius usye, tres trium proprietatum ut secundum eorum sensum intelligatur in quattuor unitatibus quaternitas non trinitas. Quoniam, inquit, paternitas et filiatione (146) et connexionē diversa sunt oportet unitates quoque que illis assunt a se invicem esse diversas. Item ait episcopus Gillibertus: Unitates que assunt paternitati et filiationi et connexionē, quibus sunt tria non modo hec praedicata, verum etiam illa de quibus praedicantur, idem pater et filius et spiritus sunt nequaquam potuerunt esse substantie. Item dicunt humanam in Christo naturam summa et immensa Dei gloria non glorificatam. Item, glosantes epistolam ad Philippenses, dicunt nomen quod est super omne nomen non esse datum homini assumpto, ita ut sit Deus nominandus, nisi forte, ut aiunt, per adoptionem, in qua significacione hoc nomen Deus non est super omne nomen. Dicunt soli verbo tunc illud nomen esse datum, cum post resurrectionem et ascensionem assumpti hominis fuit manifestatum id quod ipsi verbo assumenti fuit, inacum patre naturale nomen et eternum. Cuius nominis significatum asserunt ab homine assumpto sic alienum, sicut a corpore intelligentia, et a mente color cum tamen propter persone unitatem dicatur vere coloratus intelligere et intelligens coloratus esse. Dicunt in Christo neque divinitatem incarnatam neque humanitatem deificatam. Item, astruere conantur, hominem esse assumptum in Dei filio, sive in Deo, non in Dei filium sive in Deum, tali versutia verborum negantes hominem assumptum filium (147) Dei esse sive Deum proprie nominandum, utpote sicut estimant sic assumptum, ut sit in Deo quasi unus ex prophetis vel paulo amplius honorandus, non tamquam Deus altissimus adorandus cum de filio Dei etiam secundum quod factus est ei ex semine David, secundem carnem constet apostoli testimonium dicentis, tanto melior angelis effectus quanto differentius prae illis nomen hereditavit. Item adorent eum omnes angeli Dei. In sola quippe assumpta natura melior angelis ipse factor effectus et excelsior celis factus est, in qua et promissiones habuit patris dicentis: *Ego ero illi in patrem, et ipse erit mihi in filium.*² Neque enim hoc verbo assumenti sed homini assumendo fuit promissum, quia nomen super omne nomen, scilicet, Deus quod verbum eternaliter habuit, homini assumendo ipsa sui in Deum Dei filium assumptione conferendum fuit ex testimonio prophetarum et nunc esse collatum constat ex testimonio apostolorum. Item dicunt patris et filii et spiritus sancti divinitatem esse singularem, quo dicto favent Sabellio, et tres personas tres habere unitates, quo dicto favent Arrio; in neutro assentientes catholice fidei trinitatem in unitate non in singularitate veneranti contra Sabellium et trium non tres unitates sed unam unitatem asserenti adversus Arrium. Cum enim (148) filius dicat ego et pater unum sumus per "unum" Arrius, per "sumus" confutatur Sabellius. Per utrumque instruitur catholicus ut nec singularitatem admittat ubi audit

¹1 Cor. 2:2.

²1 Chron. 22:10. Heb. 1:5.

"sumus" nec plures unitates ubi audit "unum" sed eredat per "sumus" verbum substantivum substantivas exprimi personas, per "unum" prohiberi ne substantias plures intelligamus nos qui trinitatem in unitate et unitatem in trinitate venerandam praedicamus.

Item, de eternitate Dei Gillibertus in Boetium dieit inter cetera: Cum semper esse dicitur Deus quod usia semper eternitate intelligitur eternitatis eum temporibus hoc sensu facta collatio. Idem, sicut est una et singularis et individua et simplex et solitaria essentia qua eternus ipse fuit, est, erit Deus, ita est una et singularis et individua et simplex et solitaria mora qua vocatur eternitas qua Deus ipse fuit, est et erit eternus. Ipse namque et est et Deus et est eternus, sed est et est Deus essentia, est vero eternus mora. Non sic ortodoxi distinguunt inter Dei essentiam et eius eternitatem sicut iste novus et recens recentis Dei repertor et assertor. Unde ad huius recentis Dei, repulsam libenter audimus frequentari canticum istud in domo Iacob. *Israel, si me audieris non erit in te deus recens neque adorabis deum alienum.*¹ Dominus enim qui colitur in domo Iacob non ita est compositus ut aliud sit ipse, aliud quod est in ipso sed quod in ipso est hoc ipse est. Verbi gratia, (149) bonitas, iusticia, eternitas in ipso est et ipse est ipsa bonitas, iusticia, eternitas, qua bonus et eternus est. Unde Hylarius in libro VIII:² "Deus, inquit, inmense virtutis vivens potestas, que nusquam non assit, nec desit usquam, se omnem per sua edocet, et sua non aliud quam se esse significat; ut ubi sua insint ipse esse intelligatur." Non aliud autem sunt quam quod est ipse que sua sunt. Idem, in eodem:³ "Non humano modo ex compositis est Deus, ut in eo aliud sit quod ab eo habetur, et aliud sit ipse qui habet; sed totum, quod est, vita est." Secundum hec dicta Hilarii sic Deus habet sapientiam, iusticiam eternitatem ut sit quod habet, sapientia videlicet, iusticia, eternitas, et cetera, in hunc modum que in Deo non sunt multa sed unum. Et quidem hic sensus patet in sapientia et iusticia seu bonitate ac ceteris, quarum nomina in homine qualitativa, in Deo intelliguntur substantiva, quoniam in summa natura nihil differt sive dicatur *insta* sive iusticia, sive dicatur bona sive bonitas, idemque in ceteris intelligitur, que Deo sunt naturalia et essentialia, immo cum dicantur multa una sunt essentia. Eternitas autem sic intellecta sicut in praemissa glosa descripta est ab essentia Dei tam videtur aliena cum sit mora quedam sempiterna sicut ab hominis essentia mora etatis eius aliena est. Non sic intellexerunt eternitatem (150) in Deo patres antiqui veri Dei cultores et praedicatores in domo Iacob. Audi quid dicat Augustinus de trinitate: "Cum aliquis homo dicatur corpus et rationalis homo non uno modo vel una consideratione hec tria dicuntur. Secundum aliud enim corpus et secundum aliud rationale est et singulum horum non est totum quod homo. Illa vero summa essentia, summa vita, summa iusticia, summa sapientia, summa magnitudo, summa eternitas, et alia similiter quecumque, sunt in vocabulis multiplicia non plura significant,⁴ sed unum. Nota in his dictis eternitatem inter cetera essentialia nominata a beato Augustino. Idem, in libro Confessionum: "O eterna veritas et vera caritas et cara eternitas, tu es Deus meus."⁵ Nequaquam iste sanctus eternitatem Deum suum diceret si eam divinam substantiam non esse intelliget. Gregorius in V. libro moralium:⁶ "Quisquis iam aliquid de contemplatione eternitatis apprehenderit hanc per coeternal[m]⁷ eius speciem conspicit." Item:⁸ "Nimirum mens cum in contemplationis sublimitate suspenditur, quidquid perfecte conspicere praevallet, Deus non est; cum vero subtile aliquid conspicit, hoc est quod de incomprehensibili substantia eternitatis audit." Secundum hec dicta patrum substantiam eternitatis veneremur in Deo nostro abdicantes moram eternitatis que falso attribuitur Deo quam sicut auctor ait, nostrum nunc quasi currens facit sempiternitatem eius ab initio (152)⁹ temporis usque protractionis ad finem mora extenditur. Divinum nunc vero permanens neque movens sese atque consistens eternitatem facit, ait Boetius, nos autem expressius dicimus quia tale nunc eternitas ipsa est qua

¹ MS. d. r. n. a. d. a.; Ps. 80:10.

² Book VIII, par. 24; MIGNE, Vol. X, col. 255.

³ Book VIII, par. 43; MIGNE, Vol. X, col. 269.

⁴ MS., significant.

⁵ ST. AUGUSTINE'S *Confessions*, Bk. VII, 10 (16).

⁶ Gregorius I, *Libri Moralium sive Expositio in librum beatii Job*, Book V, par. 63.

⁷ MS., coeterna.

⁸ See note 6, par. 66.

⁹ The number 151 was omitted by the one who affixed numbers to the pages of the MS.

et Deus eternus et que Deus eternus est. Cui eternitati omnino simplici qui moram attribuit sensum Boetii non elueidat, sed obseurat, cum ille sane fidei homo scriptis Augustini, ut ipse fatetur, eruditus eidem nusquam reperiatur contrarius. Patet vero in praemissis Augustini verbis quem sensum beatus ille habuerit et docuerit de divina eternitate, quam nullatenus distingit ab ipsa divinitate, quoniam ut ipse affirmat in Deo summa essentia, summa vita, summa eternitas, unum sunt. Igitur cum de Deo dicitur: Semper est, de homine vero heri venit, non eternitatis ad tempus, sed tocius ad partem collatio est, quoniam Deus qui in eternitate sua non habet praeteritum seu futurum, sed tamen praesentialiter esse absque omnis morae protractione, ipse idem in omni temporalitatis nostre praeterito fuit, praesenti est, futuro erit quod est ei semper esse, si tamen, ut auctor ait, divinum illud tempus semper dici potest. De praedicamento¹ enim quando tractans et hoc Deo vel homini forinsecus assignans nusquam nominat eternitatem ne putas infinitatis cum re finem seu principium, seu etiam utrumque habente ullam esse collationem. Dicit autem sanctus Hilarius (153) in libro II: "*Infinitas in eterno species in imagine usus in munere.*"² Si ergo eternus est pater, eterna etiam imago patris filius, eternum quoque munus utrumque, spiritus sanctus, consequens est, ut trinus Deus omnino sit infinitus ac proinde nulli rei temporalitatis aut localitatis terminis incluse conferendus utpote substantialiter eternus, quemadmodum substantialiter est infinitus et immensus. Nam quicquid ad se dicitur Deus ut omnipotens, eternus, immensus, infinitus, immortalis, incomprehensibilis, ad essentiam eius pertinet qua unum est, quomodo relativa nomina signant proprietatum differentiam qua trinus est. Unde auctor, facta est, inquit, trinitatis numerositas in eo quod est praedicatio relationis, servato vero unitas in eo quod est indifferentia vel substantia vel operationis vel omnino eius que secundum se dicitur praedicationis. Ita igitur substantia continet unitatem, relatio multiplicat trinitatem. Hec Boetio dicente praedicatio eternitatis de Deo patre, filio, ac spiritu sancto, cum singulus eorum secundum se dicitur eternus, et tamen non tres est sed unus est, potius ad essentiam qua unum sunt quam ad proprietatum differentiam qua tres sunt, referenda est, et ideo Deum illum recentem cui eternitas asseritur non esse substantialis recipere differimus donec audiamus quid inde censeat successor Petri cui non caro et sanguis per argumenta philosophica, sed pater celestis occulta inspiratione (154) revelavit quid inter adversa vel diversa sentientes approbet vel improbet.

XLIII. DE ACCIDENTALI CONNEXIONE

Item, cum proponitur homo est Deus, vel Deus est passus accidentalis est, inquit, ista connexio, eo quod praedicamentum non secundum causam redditur subiecto quia non tamen Deus unde homo vel inde passus unde Deus quemadmodum cum dicitur corpus esse rationale vel rationale corporeum accidentalis est connexio, quia videlicet praedicatum non proprie vel ex causa convenit subiecto. Et nos quidem si de homine vel Deo agatur absolute sine respectu alicuius personae, cum proponitur homo est Deus, vel Deus est passus, propositio indefinita verum vel falsum significans, ad utrumlibet se habet et quodammodo accidentalis dici potest, quia invenitur et homo Deus et homo non Deus. Item invenitur Deus passus, filius scilicet, et Deus non passus, pater scilicet. Verum si definite Homo quem pater sanctificavit et misit in mundum supponatur, et hic Deus esse asseratur tam naturalis est ista connexio aesi proponas de Petro quod sit homo vel de homine quod sit animal. Item si definite hunc Deum et Dominum glorie affimes crucifixum, Dei filium scilicet, incarnatum, passum sub Pontio Pilato tam conveniens est connexio qua Deus passus asseritur, quam illa qua Paulus dicitur mortuus, cum nec in Paulo huma-(155)nitas, nec in Deo divinitas mortua sit, quando vel Paulus secundum solum corpus, vel Deus item secundum solum corpus mortem subiit; que intelligitur corporis et anime separatio, tam in homine Deo quam in homine non Deo. Unde huiuscemodi connexiones cum de Christo agitur accidentales dicere licet, ut aiunt, magistraliter diei possit, novitas doctrine videtur, apostolica discretione utrum ne sit profana unacum ceteris que nova nunc dicunt-

¹ MS., praecamento.

² MIGNE. Vol. X. col. 51.

tur, ventilanda, et aut roboranda si bonum, aut cassanda, si male dicuntur. Quod ipsum de ipsis quoque meis dictis censeo servandum quia ego neque adversarios meos neque me ipsum iudico. Qui autem in celis iudicat me Dominus est, qui super terram iudicat me Romanus pontifex est. Et ego divino simul et apostolico iudicio me meaque scripta seu dicta ita submitto, ut si aliud, quod absit, evangelizavero praeter quod apostolicis documentis congruit, documentum meum anathema sit. Sic etiam nova documenta glosis in apostolum et Boctium a magistro Gilliberto inserta eredimus ventilanda et suffodienda subter therebintum. Therebintus denique arbor resinam generans preciosissimam, lignum crucis, quod virtutis est optime, significat subter quam inaures totius domus Iacob sepeliuntur, ut eorum nullum ultra vestigium (156) reperiatur. Inaures enim tunc in domo Iacob non solum femine, sed viri more orientalium populorum habebant, quod mollis et effeminati animi erat instrumentum. Significant autem inanes false doctrine faleras eloquentia nitidas et fulgidas sed sensu veritatis vacuas. Quibus omnibus et quod stultum est Dei invenitur sapientius¹ et quod infirmum fortius. *Nos enim*, ait apostolus, *praedicamus Christum crucifixum, Iudeis quidem scandalum, gentibus autem stulticiam, ipsis autem vocatis, Iudeis atque Grecis, Christum Dei virtutem, et Dei sapientiam.*² Nos autem frustra sed pro re necessarias divinitus suggestum est beato Iacob ut inaures totius domus sue therebinto suffoderet quando imperfecto a filii suis filio Emor principis terre compulsus est a Sichem fugere in Bethel. Nam antehac ipse timidus adoraverat Esau, et tunc imperfecto Sichem, timuit se suosque omnes interfici in ultionem principis imperfecti et omnium illius civitatis masculorum. Sepultis vero inauribus et diis alienis de domo sua electis terror Domini invasit omnes per circuitum civitatis et non sunt ausi persequi recedentes.³ Forsitan et in diebus nostris doctrinis variis et peregrinis de medio ecclesie ablatis et dampnatis, hostibus ecclesie terror incucietur, et Romanus (157) pontifex vel alter Iacob nunc fugiens eosdem hostes, maxime cives Romanos ipsis humiliatis habitabit secure in Bethel, quod⁴ interpretatur domus Dei.⁵ Suffosis enim iam dictis inauribus venit Iacob in Bethel, ipse et omnis populus cum eo, edificavitque ibi altare appellavitque nomen loci illius Domus Dei.

XLIV. DE LEGISTIS

Possunt quoque haut absurde surdis ad legem Dei auribus et ad leges Iustiniani patulis ac pruritu magno estuantibus inaures, quas amant quasque decenter in forensi conventu ostentant, in domo Iacob denegari, ubi decentius iudicatur secundum legem Dei quam secundum legem Iustiniani vel Theodosii, quorum tamen leges non inprobamus, nisi forte alicubi discordent a divine legis constitutionibus, verum in domo Iacob simplex narratio et sincerum iudicium secundum consuetudines antiquorum pontificum Romanorum perornat ipsam domum, si lex Domini inreprehensibilis presideat in ea, tamquam domina gentium princeps provinciarum, qua dominante et regnante in domo Iacob lex forensis iudicii vel ancilla subserviat per contemptibiles ad maiora minus idoneos amministrata, sicut apostolus consultit, ne maiores qui orationi et ministerio verbi cum apostolis vacare⁶ (158) debent, nimium secularibus negotiis implicentur et per hec utiliora suffocentur. Iudices enim tam seculares quam spirituales in ecclesia Dei sufficienter ad diremptionem litium constituendos exemplis Moysi⁷ et monitis apostoli docemur, ut sit cuique liberum pro causarum qualitate nunc ecclesiasticum nunc forense iudicium expetere, ut, si non perfectionis amore vult sua contempnere, in hoc saltem valeat pulsato parcere suae innocentie lucra etiam cum dampno lucri terreni augmentare, si non apud iniquos et infideles forenses illum exponit forte cruciandum, forte spoliandum per indicem cinctum, sed pocius trahens illum ad ecclesiasticos iudices geminum lucrum consequatur et in emendatione fratris et in suis rehabitis absque vindicta sanguinis, quam non debet inferre iudex qui virgam tantum, non etiam gladium portat. Concordat his que dicimus Leo papa suis decretis, capitulo XXIImo dicens: “Aliud quidem est debita iusta reposcere, atiud propria perfectionis amore contempnere. Sed illici-

¹ Cor. 1:25.² Cor. 1: 23.⁵ Gen. 28:11 ff.; cf. ISIDORI, *Etymologic*, Bk. XV, par. 1.³ Gen. 31 and 35.⁴ *Libelli*, qui.⁶ Acts 6:1-6.⁷ Deut. 16:18.

*torum veniam postulantem oportet etiam licitis abstinere dicente apostolo: ‘Omnia licent, sed non omnia expediunt.’¹ Unde si penitentes habent causam quam negligere forte non debeant, metius expedit quis ecclesiasticum quam forense iudicium.”² Hec dicendo (159) sanctus Leo papa ostendit satis, non solum forense, sed etiam ecclesiasticum iudicium ad hoc in ecclesia Dei constitutum et suo tempore fuisse utrumque usitatum, ut in utrolibet servata distinctione lites dissolverentur, non tamen ipsa iudicia confusione Babilonica miscerentur et in quoddam neutrum verterentur, sed in ecclesiastico legibus divinis institutis canonum consuetudinibus bonis virga directionis moveretur per manum iudicis nou cincti et in forensi legibus imperialibus gladius moveretur *ad vindictam*³ malefactorum laudem vero bonorum⁴ per indicem cinctum, sed quia tales aliquando, ut Iacobus apostolus ait, *opprimunt et ipsi trahunt pauperes ad iudicia*,⁵ salubris est consuetudo in ecclesia, ut apostolus audiatur dicens: *Audet aliquis vestrum habens negotium iudicari apud iniquos et non apud sanctos?*⁶ atque ut ipse monet coram sanctis et spiritualibus⁷ interdum tractentur negotia etiam civilia non importune garritu legistarum, sed censura legum divinarum terminanda. Esset tamen utcumque tolerabile, si fidelibus et bonis legistis ad aliquam causam discutiendam a iudice spiritali advocatis, discussiones ille fierent seorsum et ad ipsum differretur et deferretur (160) finale iudicium de sententiis legistarum sive concordantium sive discordantium, ut ipse velut alter Adam videret quid vocaret eam,⁸ que a legistis essent usque in finem discussa. Sic etiam papam Eugenium vidimus aliquando fecisse, eum haberet secum peritos legis humane, quibus iu absentia sua negotia ventilantibus ipse tandem ea consummavit iudiciis finalibus. Aliquotiens tamen idem⁹ legiste permissi ante ipsum strepitu clamoroso et artificiose causas involvere sic eas intricaverunt, ut vix poterit vel ipse vel cardinalium quisquam eas dissolvere, meliusque tunc fuisse illas cinomias domui Pharaonis¹⁰ inmissas in domum Iacob non fuisse intromissas, maxime regnante Christo in domo Iacob in eternum.*

XLV. DE RANIS ET CINIFIBUS ET CINOMIAS

Non enim erraverunt patres orthodoxi qui exponentes decem plagas Egypti ranas in luto coxantes poetarum loquacitati (s)ciniplhes rostro acuto ledentes mundanorum philosophorum subtilitati, cynomias muscas caninas causidieorum forensium mordacitati eoaptaverunt, ac proinde in conventibus ecclesiasticis eos non admirerunt, ne si invicem morderent et commenderent ab invicem consumerent et per hoc iudicia ecclesie coufunderentur. Unde rationalibilis apparebat emulatio viorum (161) religiosorum super hoc dolentium quod ranis et ciniphibus a domo Iacob segregatis adhuc sustinetur in ea cinomiarum tanta importunitas, ut quotiens psallitur *misit in eos cinomiam et commedit eos cogantur gemere de his que fiunt in medio eorum que fieri decuit solummodo in medio Egyptiorum in campo Taneos*,¹¹ in terra Cham, filii Noe cuius posteritas maledicta legitur, et ideo non mirum de terra Cham, terra scilicet Egyptiorum, filiorum Cham, sic esse scriptum. *Edidit terra corum ranas in penetralibus regum ipsorum. Dicit et venit cenomia et ciniphes in omnibus finibus eorum.*¹² Optamus ergo ut has plagas ceterasque his consimiles auferat Dominus a terra sancta que data est in possessionem Iacob, cui benedixit Dominus commutauis nomen eius Israel vocaretur et ad praevalendum contra homines Dei visione confortaretur. Si, inquit, contra Deum fortis fuisti quanto magis contra homines praevalebis?¹³ Cuius ergo fortitudo est in Domino utique non indiget causidicorum forensium verbositate adiuvari ad causas dirimendas, ad quam illum satis adiuvat legis divine auctoritas dummodo vel alter Moyses recipiat et teneat consilium Ietro,¹⁴ socii Moysi, tales iudices in cooperationem sui ministri statuendo quales ille consultit sub Moyse ordinandos,

¹ Cor. 6:12.

⁵ Jas. 2:6.

⁶ 1 Cor. 6:1.

² Leo I., 410-61; cf. Epistola 167, *ad Rusticum*, Inquis. X; MIGNE, *Pat. Lat.*, Vol. LIV, col. 1206; HINCHIUS, *Decretales*, p. 617.

⁷ 1 Cor. 6:4.

⁸ Gen. 2:19.

³ MS. *vindicta*.

⁴ 1 Pet. 2:14.

⁹ *Libelli*, tandem *for* tamen idem.

¹⁰ Ex. 8:28.

¹¹ Ps. 77:12, 43.

236

¹² Ps. 104:30 f.

¹³ Gen. 32:28.

¹⁴ Cf. Exod. 18.

qui videlicet Deum timeant, diligent iusticiam, oderint avariciam. Taliū numerus in domo Iacob sufficienter multiplicatus et lege divina (162) instructus non indiget a causidicis forensibus instrui qui potius ab illo sunt instruendi. Diximus quod sentimus de causidicis forensibus discretioni apostolice, hnmiliter sugerendo quod domui Iacob decorum putamus, parati sane in talibus, etsi non libenter, attamen pacienter sustinere quod sustinet dominus domus.

XLVI. DE RECENTE DEO

In his vero novitatum doctrinis que Deum recentem introducendo apostolice ac sane fidei adversari videntur inaures chaldaico igne conflat et malleo Babilonico fabricate notantur, et ideo minime in domo Iacob sufferende putantur, cui dictum est Israel, *Si me audieris non erit in te deus recens neque adorabis deum alienum.*¹ Deus enim qualem illi describunt recens et alienus videtur nobis parvulis qui ab incunabili lactati uberibus matris ecclesie, non ita didicimus Christum sicut eum isti docent. Unde nec audemus temere in doctrina fidei subtilitates dialecticas et interdum hereticas admittere contra illius consilium qui dicit: *Videte ne quis vos decipiatur per philosophiam et inanem fallaciam secundum elementa mundi secundum traditionem hominum, et non secundum Iesum Christum.*²

Tu, ergo, Papa Adriane, aurum prurientium vana oblectamenta, et ornamenta eatenus inaudita partim superius a nobis perstricta, partim (163) sapientiorum diligentie ad investigandum servata in glosis praenotatis, vel alter Iacob sub therebinto³ erneis fortiter et alte suffodiendo et dicendo: Si quis hoc vel hoc dixerit, quod sae doctrine adversari deprehensum fuerit, anathema sit, comparabis gloriam tibi, contra hostes victoriam. *Quia enim misericordiam et veritatem diligit Deus, gratiam et gloriam dabit*⁴ *Dominus*⁵ misericordiam tenentibus et veritatem defendantibus. Attinet autem ad misericordiam errantes corriger ad veritatem, vero in scriptis argute loquentium sola maledicta dampnare ac benedicta servare. Non enim est hoc tuum qui iudicas omnem terram, *ut vel perdas iustum cum impio,*⁶ vel dampnes veritatem cum mendatio. Sic in scriptis Origenis⁷ male dicta sunt confutata et benedicta servata. Nos vero interim, donec super his iudicium procedat apostolicum, tenemus consilium apostolicum, *omnia probando, quod bonum est tenendo, et ab omni specie mala,*⁸ quantum gratia divina dignabitur iuvare, *nos abstinentio*⁹ et eos qui nos audiunt in id ipsum commonendo.

XLVII. COMMEMORATIO PRETERITORUM LABORUM

Cum essem iunior eingebam me et ambulabam ubi volebam,⁹ visitando aliquotiens apostolorum¹⁰ limina et apostolican sedem,¹¹ non tam habens interdum specialem necessitatem quam intendens ecclesie utilitatem communem, super quam et auribus apostolice (164) discretionis aliqua suggesti, que utilia putavi, propter que in *itineribus* sepi laboravi, *periculis fluminum, periculis latronum, periculis ex genere, periculis in civitate, periculis in solitudine,* periculis in falsis doctrinis et falsorum fratrum¹² infestationibus *foris pugnas, intus timores*¹³ excitantibus. Inter huiusmodi pericula Dominus gratia sua astitit michi et sancta Romana ecclesia. Hinc est, quod Petro Leonis in urbe, tirannizante atque cum esset excommunicatus ipse suique fautores, missas tamen celebrarent et ego illos negassem¹⁴ in scismate¹⁵ sub excommunicatione corpus Christi habere aut confidere posse cum grandi labore meo cogebar sententie, quam tenui et teneo, palmarum victorie coram beate memorie Innocentio papa optinere. Item contra doctrinas varias et peregrinas Petri Baiolardi auxilium meum a domino in sede apostolica, quamquam ille discipulos

¹ Ps. 80:10.² Col. 2:8.³ Cf. Gen. 35.¹¹ Ms., sede.¹² 2 Cor. 11:26.¹³ 2 Cor. 7:5.⁴ Ms. d,dns. *Libelli*, [dabit] Dominus Deus.⁵ Ps. 84:12.⁶ Gen. 18:23.¹⁴ GERHOH treats of this question in his letter to Innocent II; cf. MIGNE, 193, cols. 1375 ff. *Libelli*, III, 203 ff., especially 221 ff.⁷ Origen died 240.⁸ 1 Thess. 5:21 f.¹⁵ *Libelli*, crismate.⁹ Cf. John 21:18.¹⁰ *Libelli*, apostolicorum.

in scola sua eruditos et doctrine sue consentaneos habuissest tunc in ecclesia Romana, sicut et nunc in ea sunt qui ab episcopo Gilliberto instructi, fortasse nollent aliquid contra illum dici, sed tamen, ut spero,¹ etiam contra ipsum favebunt veritati. Similiter et pro causis aliis nichilominus ecclesiasticis multum laboravi et favente gratia Dei (165) ac Romanorum pontificum sepe optinui quod volui.

XLVIII. EXCUSATIO LABORUM DEINCEPS

Nunc autem quia senectute pariterque infirmitate corporis ita gravor, ut ultra non valeam siue ante valui laborare, optans cum beato Iob, ut *in nidulo meo moriar,² derident³ quoque me ut illum iuniores tempore, quorum non dignabar patres ponere cum canibus gregis mei,⁴* ait sanctus Iob. Et ego patres ac doctores istorum, licet magistros in scolasticis conventiculis, minime preferendos vel conferendos censeo ecclesiarum doctoribus orthodoxis, quorum doctrina fulget ecclesia ut sol et luna. Unde quotiens inter ecclesiastica et scolastica documenta contrarietatem audio, ego magis ecclesiasticis quam scolasticis fidem habeo. Et quia debilis iam corpore non valeo per me ipsum, saltem per literas inde quedam insinuare eculo illi, ad cuius pertinet officium confirmare fratres et confirmare hostes, ut *porte inferi non prevaleant⁵* in diebus nostris adversus ecclesiam Petro commissam, in petra fundatam, Petri fide roboratam.

¹ *Libelli*, spiritu.⁴ Job 30:1.² MS. moria; *Libelli*, mori.³ Job 29:18.⁵ Matt. 16:18.

L. of C.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 342 712 A